



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 99th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, September 19, 1985

The House met at 11 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Give ear to my prayer, O God; and hide not Thyself from my supplication!—Psalm 55:1.

We come before You, O God, with petitions both great and small. We pray for righteousness and justice, and we also pray for those concerns most near to our own hearts. We place before You, gracious God, our own weaknesses and anxieties and we confess that we have not done what we ought to have done and we have done those things we ought not to have done. We place before You this, our prayer, and ask Your blessing upon us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 141. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning on May 18, 1986, as "National Tourism Week."

BEDELL PROVISION NECESSARY IN FARM BILL

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will be taking up the debate on the 1985 farm bill. Next Thursday we will be voting on amendments on that 1985 farm bill.

For those of us from the Midwest, where agriculture and our farmers,

small towns, and businesses are being devastated by the present farm economy, there is one necessary provision in that farm bill. That is basically known as the Bedell provision, named after the gentleman from Iowa, BERKELEY BEDELL, providing for a referendum for a provision for a voluntary program for the farmers that permits the farmers to vote on the program itself.

That is the only provision in that farm bill that will provide for increased income for our farmers in the next 4 years. Without that provision, farmers in the Midwest can look forward to decreases in their net income. They are being devastated right now with farm prices and they cannot afford any lower farm prices.

So I ask all of my colleagues, when the amendment which will be offered, I understand, from the minority side to delete that provision, that you support the Bedell provision and oppose any amendment to strike it out.

IS THE PRICE OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT BECOMING TOO HIGH?

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, a small town in my State effectively lost representative government. It was priced out of the market. When its liability insurance coverage was terminated, virtually all of the officials resigned from office. They simply couldn't afford to put their families and careers at risk without some protection from the flood of lawsuits which are now a fact of life in government units smaller than State size.

Unfortunately, this incident is neither unusual nor trivial. Other municipalities in my State are about to lose their liability insurance. In some instances, this loss of protection could mean the loss of police and fire protection for the citizens of the community.

In a society caught up in the frenzy of suing everyone for everything, members of police and fire depart-

ments are unlikely to perform their duties without a guarantee that they will not be bankrupted by the costs of litigation, let alone the amount of a judgment.

The problem will soon enough be nationwide, if it is not already so. It is a Federal problem as well as a State problem. Many of these suits are founded on legislation passed in Congress over the past few decades. We had better find a solution before we find that representative government is too expensive a luxury.

CASTRO'S ABSURD IDEA

(Mr. SMITH of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago, the AP carried a story in which Fidel Castro blamed the United States for creating the huge market in illegal drugs and said that we should compensate developing nations for narcotics trafficking.

Castro's assertion, of course, is absurd. I doubt that he would compensate the United States—and especially the people of Florida—for the cost of holding his prisoners in our jails and helping Cuban refugees start new lives.

I doubt he would compensate the United States and our Caribbean allies for freeing Grenada from Cuban henchmen.

I doubt he would compensate those countries facing Cuban troops in Africa or Cuban-supported guerrillas in Latin America.

I doubt he would compensate the citizens of Cuba for taking from them their freedom, property, and country, for splitting families and imprisoning innocent men and women who love their country more than their personal liberty.

This simply is another attempt by Castro to divert attention from his government's own involvement in drug

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Boldface type indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

trafficking and international adventurism.

CASTRO BLAMES UNITED STATES FOR DRUG TRAFFIC, DEBTS

MEXICO CITY.—Cuban President Fidel Castro blamed the United States Tuesday for creating the huge market in illegal drugs and said it should compensate developing nations for narcotics trafficking.

Cuba's official Prensa Latina news agency, in a dispatch monitored in Mexico City, reported Castro said America was responsible for the burgeoning narcotics network in Latin America.

It said that Castro, speaking at a forum for Latin American journalists, accused the United States of having the "audacity" to send equipment to other countries to destroy marijuana fields when 48 of its own 50 states produce illegal drugs.

The agency, in an earlier dispatch, quoted Castro as telling the forum that a social upheaval must shake Latin America before the region can find the solutions to its economic problems.

"It seems that what's lacking is a previous, large-scale sacrifice, an explosion, that shakes everything, and from that point the alternatives are going to start to appear," Castro said.

Prensa Latina said Castro participated in the first session of the forum, sponsored by the news agency, on Latin America's financial crisis.

It reported Castro said the critical economic situation for many Latin American governments "means the political death of the democratic processes of Latin America, or that they resolve the problems or there will be social explosions."

The region's governments have had difficulty uniting "because we are weak, because we are fragmented, because we are dependent," he said.

Cuba's pro-Soviet government sponsored a conference in July for Latin American labor, political and social leaders, and Castro called on them to repudiate their nations' foreign debts.

GRAVE MISTAKE TO INCLUDE STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES UNDER MANDATORY SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

(Mrs. VUCANOVICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the proposal to include State and local employees under mandatory Social Security and Medicare.

My home State of Nevada has one of the best public retirement systems in this country. It has been firmly established for many years with adequate and balanced funding and benefit provisions.

I am extremely concerned about the effect of these proposals on the financial integrity of the existing State and local retirement systems, as well as the effect on the government's fiscal posture. A strong retirement system is one of the key incentives that State and local governments have to offer to attract talented and dedicated people. If the ability to offer a sound retire-

ment system is diminished in any way, it will be more difficult to recruit and retain quality people. Also, there is no question that the affected governments, in paying the employers' share of the contribution, will be adversely affected. It is even possible that many governments would have to raise entry-level salaries for their employees to take into account the fact that these employees would be required to pay Social Security and Medicare taxes.

In sum, I firmly believe that we are making a grave mistake if we are to mandate that new State and local employees contribute to Social Security and Medicare.

BIGEYE IS ANOTHER DIVAD

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in the face of \$200 billion deficits, we cannot afford to waste any money on pork barrel projects and programs that do not work. Before we fund any new program we must ask the question, is it so important that we should send our children the bill?

I was pleased to find that the Department of Defense finally found one program that was not worth the borrowed money we were paying for it: the Divad. After a number of GAO reports describing its difficulties and rising costs, the Department finally saved the taxpayer and killed the program.

Why don't they do the same thing with the Bigeye nerve gas bomb? First, like all chemical weapons, it is of doubtful effectiveness and considered relatively unimportant by military tacticians. Second, it is projected to cost over a billion dollars, yet the GAO repeatedly reports that it has failed a number of tests and is not ready for production. Finally, our allies refuse to even talk about accepting it.

Bigeye's problems are just like Divad's. Let's not send our kids the bill for this unnecessary weapon.

FREE TRADE WEAPONS ALREADY IN PRESIDENTIAL ARSENAL

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, although this reminder may not be heard amid the noisy trade deficit debate, it is worth reminding my colleagues and our President that last October the Congress passed and the President signed into law H.R. 3398, the omnibus trade bill.

The bill sailed quickly through Congress on the brisk winds of a then-

record \$70 billion trade deficit. The projected trade deficit for 1985 is \$150 billion.

In other words, we give the President expanded authority to deal with unfair trade practices overseas, he does nothing, and the trade deficit doubles.

Now there is talk of yet another trade bill.

The problem is not a lack of free trade weapons in the Nation's arsenal. The problem is that the Commander in Chief, armed by Congress in 1984 with an array of expanded authorities to deal with unfair trade practices, has opted for unconditional surrender.

To switch metaphors, when the home team is down by 150 billion points, it's time to fire the coach.

PENNSYLVANIA'S SEATBELT SAFETY AWARENESS PROJECT

(Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House of an exciting new transportation safety project. Through legislation previously approved by this House, we have been able to kick off in Pennsylvania a seatbelt safety awareness project, using prime time media and community involvement.

The evidence is overwhelming. You can avoid serious injury or death; your chances are 300 percent better of walking away from a serious car crash if you have your seatbelt on. The problem is that only about 15 percent of the people wear their seatbelts.

This is an 18-month educational program in which we will attempt to make people aware of the benefits of wearing their seatbelts, and then we will measure before and after what the effect of this is. Our hope is to then be able to develop a nationwide program, using the results of this study and the results of this educational program to save thousands of lives which are needlessly destroyed on our Nation's highways as a result of people not wearing their seatbelts.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUSTER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman did not say modestly is that he is the innovator of this great idea. I think that ought to be stated in the RECORD. I want to congratulate him for this and for all the things he has been able to do in transportation safety on the committee.

AIRPORT AND AIRWAYS TRUST FUND

(Mr. LEWIS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, with the recent, high incidence of aircraft tragedies, last week, I spoke on my concerns over the growing surplus in the airport and airways trust fund which now stands at approximately \$3 billion.

My concern is widely shared by many who have demanded that more be done to improve the safety of air travel.

I rise again to speak on this important subject because I am hearing more and more about the refusal of FAA to spend these funds or the refusal of OMB to permit FAA to spend these funds. And yet, I hear little about Congress' role in this activity. Congress must first appropriate funds for these programs.

Those of us who are serious about spending the trust fund or cutting the aviation taxes should begin by examining our own role in this. It is time to stop the finger-pointing and ask ourselves what we can do.

If these taxes are necessary for airport improvement or air safety programs, we need to ensure that the money is appropriated. If they are not needed Congress should cut the tax now.

BOYS' CLUB OF AMERICA NATIONAL YOUTH OF THE YEAR AWARD

(Mr. DANNEMEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege and honor to announce the winner of the Boys' Club of America National Youth of the Year Award, which was conferred last night at the Boys' Club ceremony at the Washington Hotel. He is Carlos Romo, a young man of 18 who hails from La Habra, CA, in the 39th District of California.

Carlos graduated from La Habra High School and is currently attending Fullerton College. His goal is to become a bilingual lawyer.

Carlos has been an active member of the La Habra Boys' Club for 9 years. This past year he gave 1,500 hours of volunteer service to the club and chaired a Keystone Club project which raised \$2,500 for pediatric cancer research. Carlos was also selected to carry the Olympic torch in last year's relay.

Carlos was a member of the student government and an all-district soccer player; his team mates selected him as "most inspirational player."

"Inspirational" is a truly appropriate word. Winning this award is a tremendous achievement for Carlos. It acknowledges and rewards his efforts and contributions toward helping his neighbors and community. Of this service Carlos can be justifiably proud, as we are all proud of him.

GIVING THE UNITED STATES A FAIR CHANCE IS NOT PROTECTIONISM

(Mr. LEVIN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the Post this morning there is a quote from a Reagan official regarding trade, and I quote him:

We promised Congress to send up some legislation of our own, but I don't know what we can give them that will change their minds. They know our hearts are not in it.

Mr. Speaker, that is the real problem. If the administration would stop worrying about throwing a sop to Congress and focus on the fact that it is a problem and on what they want to do about it, then maybe we could make some progress. There is politics in the trade issue because there is a real problem and there is no action going on within the administration.

Those of us who are concerned about this are not trying to build a wall around America. Quite the opposite, we are trying to get other countries to tear down theirs. We are trying to give U.S. industry and U.S. workers a fair chance, and I do not think that is protectionism. It may be protective. It may be "protectivism," but it is not protectionism.

Mr. Speaker, I am an internationalist, but I am not an internationalist if that means America comes last. So I say to the administration, focus on the issue. There is an issue. America has to help itself to make sure we have a fighting chance to protect American industries.

WELCOME HOME, BEN WEIR; ONE BACK, SIX TO GO

(Mr. O'BRIEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, welcome home, Ben Weir.

Your release and return to the United States is a shining beacon of hope to the families of the six Americans who remain hostages in Lebanon.

Your fortitude and grace is an example to all the world. The strength and courage of your wife, Carol, has been a source of inspiration for many of the families of the men who remain in Lebanon. Your son, John, has been dogged in his advocacy of your cause

and the cause of the group of Americans held hostage.

You, I know, would not want to let slip by this opportunity to mention that six Americans remain hostages in Lebanon.

William Buckley, a U.S. Foreign Service officer, has been held hostage 552 days, as of today.

Father Lawrence Jenco, the head of Catholic Relief Services in Beirut, has been held hostage for 255 days.

Today marks the 187th day of captivity for Terry Anderson, the Associated Press bureau chief in Beirut.

Today is the 114th day of captivity for David Jacobsen, the director of the American University Hospital in Beirut.

One hundred and one days ago, Thomas Sutherland, dean of the American University agriculture school, was taken hostage.

Today also marks the 289th day since the kidnapping of Peter Kilburn, the American University librarian.

Mr. Speaker, Rev. Benjamin Weir is home. We are eternally grateful for his release. But the hostage crisis in Lebanon continues. It is in its 552d day.

Welcome home, Ben Weir. Mr. Speaker, we're one down, six to go. Say hello to Jerry Levin.

EPA BLIND TO RABIES THREAT IN MONTANA

(Mr. MARLENEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, Montana is faced with an epidemic of deadly rabies this fall, and the reason for this epidemic is EPA red tape.

The almighty EPA has deemed it illegal for the State of Montana to use strychnine to control rabid skunks. Two weeks ago a bobcat attacked a 4-year-old boy in the boy's yard. The bobcat then attacked the boy's mother and father. The bobcat smelled of skunk, and was rabid.

The little boy, who was bitten in the neck and who thank God is still alive, is now undergoing a series of painful rabies shots. The cost of the five shots is \$850.

Mr. Speaker, will it take a loss of human life for the EPA to realize the threat rabies pose? Yesterday the EPA admitted to me that there is no alternative to strychnine in controlling rabid skunks. Rabies is a deadly threat to human health—because of its lack of sensitivity EPA has become a threat to human health.

For the past decade Montana has had an application pending before the EPA to use strychnine on a permanent basis. EPA has ignored that application and instead wants the State to comply with a 3-inch thick packet of

mandated studies and bureaucratic gobbledygook that would take the State hundreds of thousands of dollars and years to complete.

Mr. Speaker, I want the EPA to be more responsible and more responsive. I want the EPA to care more about people than paperwork.

□ 1125

LEGISLATION TO RELIEVE ONE-PERSON KEOGH PLAN OWNERS FROM FILING FORM 5500-C

(Mr. DREIER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, when Congress revised the limitations and restrictions on the various pension plans in TEFRA 1982, little was known then about the impact this would have on self-employed taxpayers with one-person Keogh accounts. Because of these changes, the IRS now requires these Keogh plan owners to file the same long and complex form, known as Form 5500-C, filed by corporate pension plans.

The self-employed have neither the time nor resources afforded a large corporation to fill out this form. Second, the IRS has not even made it clear what it is they expect to find. The need for additional information is not a legitimate reason to force thousands of self-employed small business people to pay as much as \$150 per plan to have these forms professionally prepared to prevent paying a \$25 per day penalty for late or inaccurate compliance.

For this reason, I and several of my colleagues introduced H.R. 3292, to relieve one-person Keogh plan owners from having to file Form 5500-C. This bill also calls on the IRS to promptly prescribe a new and simplified reporting return to replace Form 5500-C. This form is a clearly onerous and unjustified paperwork requirement, and I call on the rest of my colleagues in the House to join us in cosponsoring H.R. 3292.

APPROVAL OF INTERSTATE COST ESTIMATE AND INTERSTATE SUBSTITUTE COST ESTIMATE

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 1514) to approve the interstate cost estimate and interstate substitute cost estimate.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. SHUSTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not object at this time, but I take this time in order to have an opportunity to explain the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished chairman, of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate bill, S. 1514.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides for the release of interstate construction [ICE] and interstate substitute project funds [ISCE] by October 1, 1985. The Congress is required under sections 103 and 104 of title 23, United States Code, to approve the cost-based factors used by the Department of Transportation to apportion to the States interstate construction funds and interstate substitute project funds.

This bill is a 1-year approval for the release of interstate construction funds, interstate substitute project funds, and minimum allocation funds available to the States for obligation for fiscal year 1986. The House adoption of the Senate-passed bill, S. 1514, would provide for the release on October 1 of \$3.64 billion for interstate construction, \$538 million for interstate substitute highway projects, and \$650 million for the 85-percent minimum allocation program. Cost factors are also approved for the distribution of funds appropriated for interstate substitute transit projects. The apportionment factors contained in this legislation reflect the most recent adjustments to the ICE approved by Congress for the release of the 18-month backlog of interstate construction funds on March 9, 1984.

Although this legislation does not contain many of the meritorious provisions included in the committee bill, H.R. 3129, the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1985, the Committee on Public Works and Transportation has agreed to support the Senate-passed bill in order to provide for the expeditious release of the interstate and interstate substitute project funds. In the next weeks, the committee will consider pending legislation, H.R. 3129, to reauthorize the Federal-aid highway, mass transit and highway safety programs through fiscal year 1990 and to amend the Uniform Relocation Act. The committee intends to bring H.R. 3129 to the House floor for consideration during this session of the 99th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, two other issues not addressed in S. 1514 are time-sensitive and require immediate attention. Specifically, we wanted to have considered as a part of this legislation, but were precluded from adding, because of other body's objections, a provision to reprogram bridge funds in the State of Kentucky, and a provision to reduce fiscal year 1986 budget authority for highways to be consistent with reduced highway trust fund revenue projections from the Congressional Budget Office. We feel very strongly about these provisions, believe they offer a responsible course of action, and simply want to alert Members that we intend to pursue these amendments in the next appropriate legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to approve S. 1514 without amendments so that the highway program may continue and the States can proceed with important and needed highway construction projects. The House adoption of this legislation will release funding to the States in a timely manner.

Mr. SHUSTER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] for a further explanation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I will be brief, because the request made by the gentleman from New Jersey is really quite simple and should meet with no opposition. The Senate has passed a 1-year interstate cost estimate. We will now pass this same legislation. It is a routine, but critical matter, that I regret has become all too nonroutine in recent years. With enactment of this measure, the Secretary of Transportation will, on October 1, be able to apportion interstate construction, interstate substitute, and 85-percent minimum apportionment moneys to the States. Failure to pass this measure would be irresponsible.

But let me also express my disappointment at the direction in which these programs may be headed.

As some here may know, the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation was set to mark up H.R. 3129 last week when, at nearly the 11th hour, the administration, and then CBO, came in with a reevaluation of the funding capabilities of the highway trust fund. The estimates upon which all the authorizations in this 5-year legislation were based were revised, meaning we will have to significantly reduce authorizations in the bill.

The CBO analysis gives us several options to explore. The first involves deep cuts in the various highway programs beginning in fiscal year 1987. Another would be to minimize future

reductions by reexamining program increases slated to take effect in fiscal year 1986, apportionments for which are made this October 1. We could, and should, by my estimation, freeze these increases at fiscal year 1985 levels and so help maintain some stability, at higher funding levels, in our Nation's highway programs. By freezing these programs now, we will alleviate the need to cut them so deeply later.

Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred that we amend this legislation to include a freeze on these programs and send that back to the other body. Unfortunately, there was no assurance the other body would accept such a provision. And because it is so important that we approve the ICE and ISCE in a timely manner, and because there are so few days left between now and October 1, we are really left with little choice but to pass the ICE and try to attach the program freeze on the reconciliation bill, along with other pertinent provisions that might be pending such as those relating to bridge funds which should rightly be used in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SHUSTER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in strong support for S. 1514, a bill which is vitally important to the continued stability of the Interstate Highway Construction Program, and urge my colleagues to join me in voting its prompt passage.

Enactment of this bill will directly result in the release of just over \$3.6 billion in interstate construction funds, \$538 million in interstate transfer highway substitute funds, and \$649 million in 85-percent minimum allocation funds. It also approves the factors for apportionment of general Treasury revenues for interstate transfer transit substitute projects once the amount to be made available is determined through the appropriations process.

In total, this will mean that on October 1, the Secretary of Transportation will apportion a total of just over \$14 billion in formula highway funds in all categories. With other highway and highway safety funds, the total to be financed from the highway trust fund for fiscal year 1986 will be just under \$15.5 billion.

Important as these numbers are, they fail to reflect the true significance of timely approval of the interstate cost estimate. Twice now, in 1983 and 1984, it was not possible to obtain agreement between the House and Senate on legislation of which an ICE (interstate cost estimate) approval

provision was a part. For that reason, we initiated a clean ICE covering an 18-month period last spring to get the program back on track.

This is indeed an important bill. The Interstate System remains the highest priority system in the Federal-aid Highway Program. We have a real chance to complete it in the early 1990's under a reauthorization to be enacted during this Congress.

This legislation is not controversial. It is a genuinely "clean" ICE with no projects, no policy changes, no changes in eligibilities or distribution formulas. The 85-percent minimum allocation in existing law is not affected, nor is the minimum half percent of interstate provision changed in any way.

We considered adding an amendment which would have reprogrammed, for certain bridge projects, funds left over from a major bridge project which came in under budget. This would have represented no increase in budget authority.

On the basis of conversations with the other body, and in order to get the ICE through with nothing to slow it up, we have decided to proceed with this measure in the reconciliation process.

Mr. Speaker, twice in the past we have come to the floor with catch-up ICE bills to end a crisis. Today there is no crisis. We simply want to approve the ICE because it is the right thing to do. I urge enactment of the bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1514, a bill providing approval for the interstate cost estimate and interstate substitute cost estimate for 1 year.

Enactment of S. 1514 will make available to the States \$3.6 billion for interstate construction funds; approximately \$650 million in minimum allocation funds; and \$538 million for interstate substitute projects.

S. 1514 is not controversial. This bill is—in common parlance—a "clean ICE" bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support this measure.

Enactment of S. 1514 will enable the continued construction of our Interstate Highway System without interruption. Although this fact may strike some Members as hardly worth mentioning, I wish to remind everyone present of the paralysis—and crisis—atmosphere that has plagued this vital program in the last few years.

I commend the leadership of the committee, Representative HOWARD, Representative SNYDER, Representative ANDERSON, and Representative SHUSTER for the fine bipartisan manner in which they brought this legislation to the floor on such short notice.

I also wish to take this opportunity to express my concern about the future of the interstate cost estimate as it pertains to the upcoming debate on the Surface Transportation Assistance Act, H.R. 3129. It is my hope this legislation will include another feature essential to our interstate program, automatic extension of the interstate cost estimate.

As Members may be aware, Congress has been its own worst enemy when dealing with ICE. In the last few years, efforts have often been contemplated to hold ICE as a hostage for other bills and amendments. Consequently, ICE has unfairly suffered, and with it the taxpayer, interstate highway user, and industry has likewise suffered.

In order to maintain the momentum of extending ICE, as we're doing this morning with S. 1514, I am hopeful that automatic extension of ICE will be an integral part of H.R. 3129.

Thank you.

Mr. SHUSTER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would urge support for this legislation. It is a clean ICE bill. The funds come out of the highway trust fund. Indeed, it is a good day for transportation because we will be providing through this legislation the funding to keep our interstate program moving.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today is S. 1514, the Senate-passed interstate cost estimate bill. This bill would release over \$3.6 billion in interstate construction funds for use in fiscal 1986, as well as another \$1.1 billion in 85-percent minimum allocation and interstate highway transfer funds.

In order to enable the States to utilize these funds most effectively, this legislation should be passed by this October 1. Thus, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so that we may get on with our national interstate program for the coming year.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1514, a clean "ICE" bill. This bill contains none of the demonstration projects or other items that held up similar interstate cost estimate [ICE] bills for 2 years.

The Michigan highway industry, which includes our roadbuilders, cannot stand the chaos and uncertainty created in prior years by the ICE being held hostage for political reasons.

Delays in ICE approval cost our States a great deal in terms of jobs, disrupted construction schedules, unnecessary prolonging of highway safety hazards, and traffic congestion. It is for these reasons that I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1514 and I urge my colleagues to approve the fiscal year 1986 interstate cost estimate [ICE].

Enactment of this legislation would allow distribution of \$4.8 billion from the highway trust fund. These funds are essential to our effort to maintain our Nation's trans-

portation infrastructure. Approval of this bill today would allow for a timely release of these funds and preclude the economic disruptions that we have experienced in the past by failing to pass an ICE bill on time.

I would also like to commend Chairman HOWARD, Mr. SNYDER, and the rest of my colleagues on the Committee on Public Works and Transportation for acting quickly to bring this bill to the House floor. Approval of this clean bill is the responsible thing to do, and I urge my colleagues give it their support.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1514. It is vitally important that the House act favorably on this legislation, which provides approval of the interstate cost estimate and interstate substitute cost estimate.

Enactment of this measure would make available to the States \$3.6 billion for interstate construction; \$538 million for interstate highway substitute projects, approximately \$650 million in the minimum allocation funds; and funding for interstate transit substitute projects.

I am sure most if not all Members of this body remember the paralyzing effect our past failure to provide prompt ICE approval had on State highway programs.

Therefore, it is important that these estimates be approved in a timely fashion so that ICE and ISCE funds can be released on October 1 of this year.

Favorable action on this bill would provide important funding for Arkansas' highway program. Even though the State's interstate system is completed, Arkansas would receive about \$18.2 million in interstate construction funds.

These funds can be used for interstate 4R projects as well, and to the extent that the State does not need these funds for 4R work, they can be used for other Federal-aid highway projects such as Highway 71.

Arkansas would be expected to receive about \$8.5 million under the 85-percent minimum allocation program, which provides each State return of at least 85 percent of the revenue it contributes to the highway trust fund, excluding revenues going into the mass transit account.

These funds can be used on any Federal-aid highway project, and in that regard, Highway 71 would be the kind of project on which the State would consider using its minimum allocation funds.

I urge my colleagues to approve S. 1514.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1514

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

APPROVAL OF INTERSTATE COST ESTIMATE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987

SECTION 1. The Secretary of Transportation shall apportion for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, the sums au-

thorized to be appropriated for such period by section 108(b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, as amended, for expenditure on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways using the apportionment factors contained in revised table 5 of the Committee Print Numbered 99-68 of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

APPROVAL OF INTERSTATE SUBSTITUTE COST ESTIMATE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Transportation shall apportion for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, the sums to be apportioned for such year under section 103(e)(4) of title 23, United States Code, for expenditure on substitute highway and transit projects, using the apportionment factors contained in the Committee Print Numbered 99-69 of the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OIL HEAT CENTENNIAL YEAR

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 115) to designate 1985 as the "Oil Heat Centennial Year," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Chairman, Mr. GARCIA and the senior Republican on the subcommittee, Mr. HANSEN, for bringing my resolution to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 115) designates 1985 as "Oil Heat Centennial Year." It commemorates the 100th anniversary of the granting of the first patent for oil burners, and the 100th anniversary of the use of oil heat. Times have certainly changed since August 11, 1885, when the U.S. Patent Office granted a patent to David H. Burrell of Little Falls, NY, for a furnace generally regarded as the first technically sound oil burner. Back then, some saw oil burners as "instruments of Satan that brought the fires of hell to Earth."

Today, millions of Americans depend on oil heat to provide comfort for schools, businesses, factories, and homes. By the 1970's, oil burner tech-

nology had adapted to the heating needs of over 15 million individuals.

The oil heat industry is, and always has been developed and characterized by a large and diverse group of competitive small businesses which are in the forefront of the new energy efficient technologies of the 1980's. These businesses are leading the way toward higher efficiency oil heat, new conservation techniques, solar heating, and other technologies.

Today, I commend the many thousands of men and women who have developed the oil heat industry in our Nation over the past 100 years. They deserve our commendation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 115

Whereas, on August 11, 1885, the United States Patent Office granted a patent to David H. Burrell of Little Falls, New York, for a furnace that could burn liquid and gaseous fuels, which patent is generally regarded by technical experts and industrial historians as the first technically sound oil burner;

Whereas at the Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893 oil burners, for the first time, were utilized in major public exhibit buildings, and these oil burners were hailed and recognized as a technological breakthrough by most, but were condemned as "instruments of Satan that brought the fires of hell to Earth" by some;

Whereas, by World War I, the oil burner had become the premier naval source of propulsion; its technology was sought and adopted by Russia, Germany, Great Britain, France, and the United States to power large warships, especially superdreadnoughts and battle cruisers; and oil burning techniques and oilfield locations became a major source of naval espionage;

Whereas oil burner technology was adopted to the heating needs of homes, businesses, and industry in the decades that followed World War I, increasing from about twelve thousand installations in 1920 to two million in 1940 to about ten million in 1960 to more than fifteen million in the 1970's, helping to generate improved housing for all Americans and the industrial boom that powered post-World War II America;

Whereas the oil burner continues to be a major, modern heating technology used by millions of consumers in the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and the District of Columbia;

Whereas the oil heat industry is, and always has been, developed and characterized by a large and diverse group of competitive small businesses, many of which are family owned through a second, third, and

fourth generation that began in their business endeavors by supplying ice, lumber, coal, and then oil, to their communities;

Whereas many of these small businesses are in the forefront of new energy efficient technologies of the 1980's, leading the way toward higher efficiency oil heat, new conservation techniques, solar heating, and other technologies; and

Whereas the one hundredth anniversary of the development of the oil burner is an appropriate time to recognize the overall contributions of oil heating to the technological revolution of the twentieth century and the individual contributions of the many thousands of small business men and women who made this century of heating comfort progress possible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the year 1985 is designated as the "Oil Heat Centennial Year" thereby recognizing the contributions of the oil heat industry over the past century. The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe this commemorative year, with appropriate Federal agencies to participate in the observance of such year and cooperate with persons and institutions conducting related observances, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MENTAL ILLNESS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 67) to designate the week of October 6, 1985, through October 12, 1985, as "Mental Illness Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 67, designating the week of October 6, 1985, as "Mental Illness Awareness Week." As a cosponsor of the House companion bill, House Joint Resolution 78, I commend the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] for bringing the resolution before us today. We would hope that by bringing attention to the overwhelming number of Americans who suffer from one or more forms of mental disorders that the plethora of social stigmas surrounding these diseases will be eliminated in light of improvements in their diagnosis, treatment, and cure.

In spite of a quantum leap in the success of treatments for even the most severe cases of mental illness such as schizophrenia and panic disorders, cruel facts reveal an astonishing 31 to 41 million Americans who suffer from clearly diagnosable mental disorders. What this means in terms of reduced national productivity, not to mention exorbitant health costs, is disconcerting. It is estimated that Americans spend \$87 billion annually to provide treatment to those who are incapable, because of their illness, to contribute their talents and energy to society.

Even more distressing are the effects that mental illness has on our youth—at least 12 million children are afflicted, thus crippling our country's ability to carve a dynamic future. And what could be more distressing than the fact that mental disorder-related deaths are estimated to be at least 33,000 annually?

We are not, however, placed in a no-win situation. Recent years have held the key to effectively managing a whole host of previously feared and ignored illnesses. Appropriate treatment has also demonstrated to be cost-effective in terms of restored productivity, reduced utilization of other health services and lessened social dependence. The horrors of mental institutions in which patients are treated like virtual animals is being replaced by a variety of efficacious remedies which allow sufferers to be reintegrated into society.

At a time when scientific knowledge is providing the means to treat and cure all forms of disease, public awareness should be continually nurtured so as to ensure the removal of any destructive taboos which could stifle progress in this area. While many improvements have already been realized, awareness of these disorders must attain such a level whereby the distinction between the treatability of physical and mental disorders becomes indistinguishable.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to adopt Senate Joint Resolution 67, recognizing the need to ensure prompt and effective treatment of all diseases including those which in the past have been deemed untreatable and socially unacceptable.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 67

Whereas mental illness is a problem of grave concern and consequence in American society, though one widely but unnecessarily feared and misunderstood;

Whereas thirty-one to forty-one million Americans annually suffer from clearly diagnosable mental disorders involving significant disability with respect to employment, attendance at school, or independent living;

Whereas alcohol, drug, and mental disorders affect almost 19 per centum of American adults in any six-month period;

Whereas mental illness in at least twelve million children interferes with vital developmental and maturational processes;

Whereas mental disorder-related deaths are estimated to be thirty-three thousand with combined suicide accounting for at least twenty-nine thousand, although the real number is thought to be at least three times higher;

Whereas our growing population of the elderly is particularly vulnerable to mental illness;

Whereas mental disorders result in staggering costs to society, totaling an estimated \$87,000,000,000 in direct treatment and support, and indirect costs to society, including lost productivity;

Whereas mental illness is increasingly a treatable disability with excellent prospects for amelioration and recovery when properly recognized;

Whereas in recent years there have been unprecedented major research developments bringing new methods and technology to the sophisticated and objective study of the functioning of the brain and its linkages to both normal and abnormal behavior;

Whereas research in recent decades has led to a wide array of new and more effective modalities of treatment (pharmacological, behavioral, psychosocial) for some of the most incapacitating forms of mental illness (including schizophrenia, major affective disorders, phobias, and panic disorders);

Whereas appropriate treatment of mental illness has been demonstrated to be cost effective in terms of restored productivity, reduced utilization of other health services, and lessened social dependence; and

Whereas recent and unparalleled growth in scientific knowledge about mental illness has generated the current emergence of a new threshold of opportunity for future research advances and fruitful application to specific clinical problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning on October 6, 1985, is hereby designated as "Mental Illness Awareness Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SPINA BIFIDA MONTH

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 111) to designate the month of October 1985 as "National Spina Bifida Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the

House that the minority has no objection to the legislation being considered.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 111, a resolution designating October 1985 as National Spina Bifida Month. I extend my appreciation to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI] the author of the House companion bill, House Joint Resolution 179, of which I am a cosponsor, for working so diligently to bring this legislation to the floor today.

Spina bifida results from the failure of the spine to close properly during prenatal development. Infants afflicted with spina bifida are born literally, with an opening at the base of their spine. While spina bifida is relatively common; it occurs in 1 out of every 1,000 births, little is known about this crippling disease. When a representative from the National Spina Bifida Association came to speak with me about spina bifida, she told me about her son who was born with spina bifida. At the time of his birth, a little over a decade ago, the doctors didn't even know what to do with him. The young infant suffered through a series of needless operations and subsequent infections before he was able to get the type of medical care he so desperately needed. We have made great strides in recognizing and treating spina bifida since this boy's birth, however not enough is being done.

By designating October 1985 as National Spina Bifida Month we will be lending our hand in a fight to treat and cure spina bifida. The March of Dimes has been in the forefront of the battle to educate the public on the importance of prenatal development and helping our physically handicapped lead happy, productive lives. Let us in Congress do our part by adopting Senate Joint Resolution 111, designating October 1985 as Spina Bifida Month.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 111

Whereas spina bifida is a birth defect in the spinal column which occurs in one of every one thousand births in the United States;

Whereas spina bifida is the most commoncrippler of newborns, resulting when one or more bones in the back (vertebrae) fail to close completely during prenatal development;

Whereas while the cause of spina bifida is not known, it appears to be the result of multiple environmental and genetic factors;

Whereas although most of the March of Dimes and Easter Seal poster children have spina bifida, many people have not heard of the defect;

Whereas only a few cities in the United States have proper care centers and specialized professionals that can provide the most effective, aggressive treatment for children and adults with spina bifida; and

Whereas an increase in the national awareness of the problem of spina bifida

may stimulate the interest and concern of the American people, which may lead, in turn, to increased research and eventually to the discovery of a cure for spina bifida: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the month of October 1985 is designated "National Spina Bifida Month" and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEARNING DISABILITIES AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 287) to designate October 1985 as "Learning Disabilities Awareness Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 287, of which I was a cosponsor, designating October 1985 as "Learning Disabilities Awareness Month." I wish to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] for sponsoring this legislation, promoting awareness of a handicap which afflicts approximately 10 million American children.

I speak of a learning disability in terms of a handicap because, like any physical handicap, it is unquestionably restricting. A person, is indeed handicapped when he is incapable of coping with such essential daily activities as reading and writing. While someone in a wheelchair may draw more sympathy from observers, the invisible confinement caused by a learning disability is no less debilitating.

Consider the child who is held back by a learning disability. Frequently, the learning disabled student is included in the ranks of the permanently disabled simply because his parents, teachers or physicians are unwilling or unable to detect the source of his learning difficulties. He may be mislabeled as a slow learner and thus suspended from learning that which is in his realm vis-a-vis attainable potential growth.

The most famous case of mislabeling involved Albert Einstein, the brilliant scientist and mathematician. His grade school teachers thought that he was mentally re-

tarded because of his slowness in reading and writing. We now know that Albert Einstein had dyslexia, which is a form of learning disability. Unfortunately, no one thought to connect his difficulties with a learning disability, preferring to deem his case hopeless—a perfect example of society's ignorance with respect to the manner in which learning disabilities manifest themselves. It is essential that parents, educators, and physicians be aware of the nature of learning disabilities and moreover, be acquainted with the available educational and medical resources which will serve to bestow upon these children every chance for a happy and productive adult life.

How can the above stated goal be achieved? First, awareness of the problem is essential to its eventual resolution. More effective programs to guarantee early diagnosis and treatment will be contingent upon public concern and support of these programs. Furthermore, the hundreds of national and local support groups for learning disabled persons must be encouraged to continue their invaluable service of generating innovative methods of treatment. Parents and professionals should also be recognized for their ceaseless work in meeting the challenges presented by these disabilities. The designation of October 1985 as Learning Disabilities Awareness Month, would encourage these good works and serve to recognize the achievements already attained by the learning disabled and their families.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 287, establishing a National Disabilities Awareness Month, with the hope that the potential learning ability of each and every child will be achieved.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of House Joint Resolution 287, which designates October 1985 as "Learning Disabilities Awareness Month."

First, I would like to thank my colleague from California, Congressman GEORGE BROWN, for his leadership on this issue. I also would like to extend my thanks and deep appreciation to Carrie Rozelle, president of the Foundation for Children With Learning Disabilities. For her long-time efforts and diligence in helping increase our awareness of learning disabilities.

Millions of Americans, including more than 10 million children, suffer from learning disabilities. The learning disabled are likely to have problems with coordination, memory, concentration or their ability to perform language tasks. Until recently, many learning disabled were misdiagnosed as being "problem children" or "slow" or even retarded. Actually, the learning disabled suffer from neurological problems and, with proper diagnosis and remediation, they can overcome their disabilities.

The real key to helping the learning disabled is increased awareness by parents, teachers, the public, and the learning disabled themselves. By recognizing the signs of learning disabilities, particularly at a young age, the learning disabled can re-

ceive the attention and training that they need and deserve. With patience and understanding, the learning disabled can achieve their full potential. If this measure helps to educate and identify the learning disabled, then it will have achieved its purpose.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H.J. RES. 287

Whereas millions of Americans suffer from 1 or more learning disabilities;

Whereas it is estimated that 10,000,000 American children have been diagnosed as suffering from learning disabilities;

Whereas most learning-disabled persons are of normal or above normal intelligence but cannot learn to read and write in the conventional manner;

Whereas it is important for parents, educators, physicians, and learning-disabled persons to be aware of the nature of learning disabilities and the resources available to help learning-disabled persons;

Whereas early diagnosis and treatment of learning-disabled children gives such children a better chance for a happy and productive adult life;

Whereas the courage necessary for learning-disabled persons to meet their special challenges should be recognized;

Whereas hundreds of national and local support groups for learning-disabled persons, parents of learning-disabled children, and professionals who work with learning-disabled persons have made important contributions to the treatment of learning disabilities;

Whereas research and study have contributed to public knowledge about learning disabilities, but much remains to be learned; and

Whereas public awareness of and concern about learning disabilities may encourage the establishment of the programs necessary to promote early diagnosis and treatment of learning disabilities and to help learning-disabled persons and their families cope with their learning disabilities. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 1985 hereby is designated "Learning Disabilities Awareness Month", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon all public officials and the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1140

NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J.

Res. 141), to designate the week beginning on May 18, 1986 as, "National Tourism Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BADHAM].

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, as vice chairman of the Congressional Travel and Tourism Caucus, I am keenly aware of the economic, social and cultural importance of tourism to the United States. This is why I am pleased to cosponsor National Tourism Week for 1986 just as I have since its inception in 1984.

We should keep in mind that travel and tourism in America directly generated more than 4.6 million jobs in 1983. This ranks travel and tourism as a leading private employer creating new jobs faster than the rest of our economy, particularly for minority groups, women and youth. In my home State of California, travel and tourism is the third largest employer in the State.

Tourism is the second largest service industry export for the United States. In 1983, it accounted for almost one-third of all receipts from service exports. At a time when we are trying to reduce our trade deficit and improve our international balance of payments, more attention should be paid toward promoting tourism to the United States which stimulates our economy by bringing in new revenue.

In addition to the economic benefits we received from tourist spending, we should not overlook that travel and tourism creates a better understanding among people. By venturing out and exploring other areas of our country, our citizens expand their horizons and have a greater appreciation for just what an amazing and beautiful country we have. By encouraging foreign travelers to visit our country, we help break down barriers and welcome those from other lands to really experience America first hand and get to know our people.

National Tourism Week is an important celebration each May as we recognize just how crucial tourism really is and demonstrate our support for it. I am proud to be a cosponsor again for National Tourism Week and urge my fellow citizens to actively participate in next year's State and local celebrations.

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, let me just express my appreciation and to identify with the point that has been made by all of the speakers here. Tourism is extremely important. This resolution is extremely important as well.

But I cannot help but point out the irony of the Congress here stating the importance of tourism at the same time that the administration is attempting to totally eliminate the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration, which is the sole remaining vestige of executive concern about travel and tourism in this country.

I am hopeful that this resolution can be forwarded to the White House. Perhaps they will think through their commitment to eliminating this very important agency that plays a key part in tourism and travel in this country.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, when one hears of travel and tourism the tendency is to think of recreation and relaxation away from home. The Congressional Travel and Tourism Caucus, of which I am chairman, seeks to bring about an awareness that tourism means jobs and increased revenue to our Federal Treasury. At a time when we are striving to reduce the Federal deficit, more attention should be paid toward promoting tourism and recognizing the tremendous economic benefit derived from tourist spending.

To highlight the importance of tourism to the United States, we have celebrated National Tourism Week each May for the past 2 years. I am pleased to announce that 260 Members of Congress have cosponsored House Joint Resolution 296 to officially designate the week of May 18, 1986, as National Tourism Week. This past May thousands of our citizens participated in State and local activities marking the occasion. Many Governors proclaimed National Tourism Week in their States and held special tourism programs. In my home State of Tennessee, our Tennessee Welcome Centers' Reservation System members provided complimentary selected rooms, campground spaces and meals to travelers during National Tourism Week. Other exciting activities around the country included a "Today" television interview by Commerce Under Secretary for Tourism, Donna Tuttle; an "Invite a Friend to Cincinnati" call in; a boat parade in St. Thomas Harbor; a 10-kilometers travel run with total cash

prizes of \$12,000; and a Southeastern Tourism Society hoedown on the Mall in Washington, DC. Medical coverage was extensive including supplements in Time and USA Today emphasizing this year's theme that "Tourism Works for America."

Next year's National Tourism Week activities promise to be bigger and better than ever. The Travel and Tourism Caucus will again be joining the Governors and State travel directors in celebrating the important role of tourism to our country.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's fine remarks.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 141, designating the week of May 1986 as National Tourism Week. I would like to thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BONER], chairman of the Congressional Travel and Tourism Caucus, for introducing the House companion measure, House Joint Resolution 296, of which I am a cosponsor. Adoption of this resolution will mark the third year in a row that Congress has been able to recognize the importance of tourism to our U.S. economy. I am pleased to be able to join in this fitting recognition.

The 22d Congressional District of New York which I am proud to represent, surrounds the majestic Hudson River. Our close proximity to New York City, makes the Hudson Valley an ideal resort area. Visitors to the region are in close proximity to both the city and the country. The splendor that is the Catskill Mountain region is a short 1-hour drive from the heart of Manhattan. Once there, visitors can enjoy the beauty of the region in any number of parks, lakes, and historic landmarks. If you have never traveled to this marvelous area I assure you—you will love New York. It is truly breathtaking any time of the year. Without question travel and tourism is alive and well in the historic Hudson River Valley.

The designation of National Tourism Week allows us to pay tribute to the multi-billion-dollar travel and tourism industry and its enormous contribution to our continued economic recovery. Accordingly, it was with great dismay that I noted the elimination of funding for the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration [USTTA] from the fiscal year 1986 budget resolution. Indeed, I joined with 26 of my colleagues in a letter to House Energy and Commerce Committee chairman, JOHN DINGELL, urging the committee to save the USTTA during consideration of their reconciliation legislation I am pleased to note here that the committee shares our support of the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration's mission to promote travel and tourism in the United States and voted yesterday against reporting language abolishing USTTA. I commend the committee on their vote and urge their continued support of the USTTA.

I look forward to joining in the many celebrations commemorating National Tourism Week this coming May. Accord-

ingly, I urge my colleagues to support Senate Joint Resolution 141, designating the week of May 18, 1986, as National Tourism Week.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 141

To designate the week beginning on May 18, 1986, as "National Tourism Week".

Whereas tourism is vital to the United States, contributing to economic prosperity, employment, and international balance of payments;

Whereas travelers from the United States and other countries spent \$210,000,000,000 in the United States during 1983, directly producing four million, six hundred thousand jobs, \$45,800,000,000 in wages and salaries, and over \$25,000,000,000 in Federal, State, and local tax revenues;

Whereas, if viewed as a single retail industry, the travel and tourism sector of the economy constituted the second largest retail industry in the United States in 1983 as measured by business receipts;

Whereas tourism contributes substantially to personal growth, education, and intercultural appreciation of geography, history, and people of the United States;

Whereas tourism enhances international understanding and good will; and

Whereas, as people throughout the world become aware of the outstanding cultural and recreational resources available across the United States, travel and tourism will become an increasingly important aspect of the daily lives of the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning May 18, 1986, is hereby designated as "National Tourism Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DENTAL HYGIENE WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 218), to designate the week beginning September 15, 1985, as "National Dental Hygiene Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object but simply would like to inform the

House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 218

Whereas dental hygienists, as licensed oral health professionals, have been actively involved in promoting oral health and preventing oral disease for more than 70 years;

Whereas dental hygienists, as preventive specialists, contribute to the dental health of the American people and provide an essential service for their total health;

Whereas dental hygienists voluntarily donate time and effort to provide dental education and preventive dental care services to groups with special needs, such as elderly persons, mentally or physically disabled persons, underprivileged persons, and children; and

Whereas it is appropriate to honor the dental hygienists of the Nation and to encourage the people of the Nation to become familiar with and appreciative of the practice of dental hygiene: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning September 15, 1985, hereby is designated "National Dental Hygiene Week", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to celebrate such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SEWING MONTH

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 173), to designate the month of September 1985 as "National Sewing Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BONER] who is the chief sponsor of National Sewing Month.

Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chair-

man BOB GARCIA and ranking minority member JIM HANSEN for bringing the National Sewing Month resolution to the floor.

This is the fourth year I have introduced this resolution and, with today's action, it will be the fourth year the Congress will have passed the resolution calling upon the President to issue a proclamation commemorating National Sewing Month.

Some of my colleagues have "needed" me about National Sewing Month. Others have questioned whether sewing is really part of the "fabric of American life." A few of my Democratic colleagues have even asked whether this resolution is really a tribute to the traditional Republican cloth coat. Let me respond by saying that every article of clothing, including Republican cloth coats, starts with the manufacture and selection of fabric, which is carefully cut and sewn with the skill of a tailor and seamstress, then packaged and delivered to one of the thousands of retail clothing stores in our Nation.

In all seriousness, National Sewing Month commemorates not only the contribution the sewing industry makes to our Nation's economy, but also to the millions of individuals who have acquired sewing skills in the home and school. National Sewing Month coincides with an industrywide promotion designed to increase home sewing interest, consumer education, and family sewing participation with a single universal theme.

For years, indeed for generations, the fundamentals of sewing have been taught in the family setting as well as the home economics classes of local elementary and secondary schools. For most individuals, sewing remains oriented toward the family and the home. It is estimated that over 50 million Americans sew at home and over 40 million sew at least part of their wardrobe. For others, of course, acquired sewing skills have led to valuable and creative careers in fashion design, retail merchandising, interior design, patternmaking, and the manufacture of textiles. The great majority of these careers have had their genesis in a home economics class where the enjoyment, pride, and creativity associated with sewing are first encountered.

The home sewing industry contributes greatly to the economic life of our Nation. The industry directly employs thousands of people. In addition, thousands more are teachers, mechanics, truck drivers, contractors, and other professionals associated with the home sewing industry. The industry generates over \$3.5 billion in sales annually and invests millions of dollars in new plant and equipment. And, of course, many congressional districts represent factories, plants, stores, and sewing industry employees.

I again would like to thank Chairman GARCIA, ranking minority member JIM HANSEN and the members of the Census and Population Subcommittee for bringing this resolution celebrating National Sewing Month to the floor today.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 173

Whereas the sewing industry annually honors the approximately fifty million people who sew at home and the approximately forty million people who sew at least part of their wardrobe;

Whereas the home sewing industry generates over \$3,500,000,000 annually for the economy of the United States; and

Whereas innumerable careers in fashion, retail merchandising, design, patternmaking, and textiles have had their genesis in the home and in elementary school home economics classes; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the month of September 1985 is designated "National Sewing Month". The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FARM AID DAY

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 384), designating September 22, 1985, as "Farm Aid Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a few moments because I believe this resolution is going to have a tremendous impact on the future of many of our farmers in the United States. It is interesting that I represent an inner city, in the city of

New York, and that we are here talking about and I am here talking about farmers. But having watched a couple of newscasts, and watched Willie Nelson, who is one of the great American singers, and who is undertaking this task, I must commend him here publicly on the floor of this House.

But, coupled with that, there is no question in my mind that as we approach next week when we are going to be talking about the farm aid bill, and I come from, as I said before, the inner city of New York, that we are in this together, whether we are farmers from the rural communities of the Midwest or what part of the country, or whether we come from the cities of this great Nation. We have a serious problem today, and I would hope that that concert that is being put together on behalf of the farmers is something that will ring and come across to all Americans.

Farmers on almost a daily basis are going bankrupt, and I believe we have a crisis. I hope again that this concert is a concert that will really touch the minds and spirits of Americans.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the excellent remarks of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 384

Whereas the United States agricultural industry employs more people than any other sector of the economy;

Whereas the United States agricultural industry is in dire need of financial assistance;

Whereas the people of the United States must be made aware of the agricultural crisis which looms over the entire United States economy;

Whereas, on September 22, 1985, performers from all over the United States will gather to give the Farm Aid benefit concert, sponsored by country music legend Willie Nelson, which will be nationally broadcast live from the University of Illinois stadium in Champaign, Illinois;

Whereas the unity of, and cooperation among, concerned and caring performers, leaders, private voluntary organizations, corporations, government agencies, and others who are creating the Farm Aid concert will make it possible for the broadcast of the concert to heighten public awareness of the farmers' plight and stimulate financial contributions for needy farmers;

Whereas the broadcast of the Farm Aid concert will enable more than 2,500,000 people in the United States to learn more about the growing crisis in the United States agricultural industry, and will allow each individual to make a difference in the future production of food for our Nation; and

Whereas the magnitude of the farm crisis makes it both a rural and an urban problem,

and therefore a problem which must be immediately addressed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That September 22, 1985, is designated as "Farm Aid Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the several joint resolutions just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMTRAK REAUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 263 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2266.

□ 1155

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2266), authorizing appropriations for Amtrak for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, establishing a commission to study the financial status of Amtrak, and for other purposes, with Mr. BENNETT (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, September 17, 1985, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the reported bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section shall be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 601(b)(2) of the Rail Passenger Service Act (45 U.S.C. 601(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking out "and" after "403(b) of this Act";

(2) in subparagraph (B) by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

"(C) not to exceed \$616,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986."

(b) LIMITATION.—Such section 601(b) is further amended by adding at the end a new paragraph as follows:

"(5) Unless sufficient funds are otherwise available to operate the Corporation's rail system at substantially the same level of service, maintenance, and equipment overhauls in effect on the date of the enactment of this paragraph, funds appropriated to or for the benefit of the Corporation under this section before the date of the enactment of this paragraph which the Corporation has designated for nonoperational capital projects shall be used as necessary to maintain the operations of the system at such level."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 1?

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

SEC. 2. STUDY COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a commission to be known as the National Railroad Passenger Corporation Financial Status Commission (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) PURPOSE OF COMMISSION.—The purpose of the Commission is to study—

(1) the ability of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (hereafter in this Act referred to as "Amtrak") to continue to improve, or to accelerate the improvement of, its financial performance;

(2) the short-term and long-term capital needs of Amtrak; and

(3) alternative funding mechanisms for Amtrak.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of fifteen members as follows:

(A) Two State legislators appointed by the National Conference of State Legislators, one from the area comprised of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, and one from outside such area.

(B) Two members of the National Association of Railroad Passengers appointed by the President of such Association, one who lives in the area comprised of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, and one who lives outside such area.

(C) A Member of the United States Senate appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate.

(D) A Member of the United States House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House.

(E) A State transportation official from a State financially participating in the program established under section 403(b) of the

Rail Passenger Service Act, appointed by the Executive Director of the National Conference of State Railway Officials (NCSRO).

(F) A State transportation official from a State not participating in the program established under section 403(b) of the Rail Passenger Service Act, appointed by the Executive Director of the National Conference of State Railway Officials (NCSRO).

(G) A representative of the Department of Transportation designated by the Secretary of Transportation.

(H) A person appointed by the Railway Labor Executives' Association.

(I) A representative of freight railroads appointed by the Association of American Railroads or its successor.

(J) Two commuter authorities, as such term is defined for purposes of the Rail Passenger Service Act, appointed by the American Public Transit Association; one that operates exclusively within the area comprised of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia and one that operates exclusively outside such area.

(K) A person from the private sector, appointed by the President, with no financial interest in Amtrak or any competing mode of transportation.

(L) A representative of the passenger bus industry appointed by the President.

(2) SELECTION.—The members of the Commission shall be selected in accordance with paragraph (1) within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) EXPENSES.—Members of the Commission shall each be reimbursed actual expenses incurred in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(4) QUORUM.—Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(5) CHAIRMAN.—The Chairman of the Commission shall be elected by the members of the Commission from among such members.

(6) ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING.—The members of the Commission shall hold their first meeting for the purpose of organizing the Commission and electing a Chairman under paragraph (4) within ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(7) All meetings of the Commission shall be open to the public.

(d) STAFF OF COMMISSION.—

(1) STAFF.—Subject to such rules as may be prescribed by the Commission, the Chairman may appoint such personnel as the Chairman considers appropriate.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.—The staff of the Commission shall be appointed subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(3) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—Subject to such rules as may be prescribed by the Commission, the Chairman may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(4) STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon request of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties under this Act.

(e) POWERS OF COMMISSION.—

(1) **HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.**—The Commission, or, if so authorized by the Commission, any three members of the Commission, may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence, as the Commission considers appropriate. The Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before it.

(2) **OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.**—The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

(3) **MAILS.**—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(4) **ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.**—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

(f) **REPORT.**—The Commission shall transmit to the Congress a report not later than March 30, 1986. The report shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it considers appropriate.

(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this section not to exceed \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 3. CAPITAL ASSETS.

Section 304(c) of the Rail Passenger Service Act (45 U.S.C. 544(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) The preferred stock issued pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall be deemed to have been issued as of the date of receipt by the Corporation of the funds for which such stock is issued."

SEC. 4. GOVERNMENT TRAVEL.

Section 306(f) of the Rail Passenger Service Act (45 U.S.C. 546(f)) is amended by inserting ", which shall include allowing the Corporation to participate in the contract air program administered by the General Services Administration in markets where service provided by the Corporation is competitive as to rates and total trip times" before the period.

SEC. 5. REPORT CONSOLIDATION.

Section 308(a) of the Rail Passenger Service Act (45 U.S.C. 548(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Corporation shall submit to the Congress a report not later than February 15 of each year. The report shall include, for each route on which the Corporation operated intercity rail passenger service during the preceding fiscal year, data on ridership, passenger miles, short-term avoidable profit or loss per passenger mile, revenue-to-cost ratio, net, the Federal subsidy, the non-Federal subsidy, and ontime performance."

SEC. 6. CHARTER TRAINS

Section 402 of the Rail Passenger Service Act (45 U.S.C. 562) is amended:

- (1) by repealing subsection (g); and
- (2) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (g).

SEC. 7. MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS.

(a) **AUDITS.**—Section 805 of the Rail Passenger Service Act (45 U.S.C. 644) is amended:

(1) in subsection (2)(A) by striking out "shall conduct annually a" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "may conduct"; and

(2) in subsections (2)(A) and (2)(B) by striking "audit" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "audits".

(b) **REPEAL OF STUDIES AND REPORTS.**—Sections 306(k), 806, 810, and 811 of the Rail Passenger Service Act (45 U.S.C. 546(k), 645, 649, and 650) are repealed.

(c) **EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE.**—Title VII of the Rail Passenger Service Act (45 U.S.C. 621 and 622) is repealed.

(d) **NORTHEAST CORRIDOR REPORTS.**—Section 703(1)(D) of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (45 U.S.C. 853(1)(D)) is repealed, effective October 1, 1986.

(3) **PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CENTER.**—Section 305(1) of the Rail Passenger Service Act (45 U.S.C. 545(1)) is repealed.

SEC. 8. REVENUE-COST RATIO.

Section 404(c)(4)(A) of the Rail Passenger Service Act (45 U.S.C. 564(c)(4)(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "Commencing in fiscal year 1986, the Corporation shall set a goal of recovering an amount sufficient that the ratio of its revenues, including contributions from States, agencies, and other persons, to costs, excluding capital costs, shall be at least 61 percent."

SEC. 9. LABOR-RELATED COST SAVINGS.

Amtrak and the representatives of employees of Amtrak shall negotiate changes in existing agreements between such parties that will result in substantial cost savings to Amtrak, and shall report the results of such negotiations to the Congress within six months after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 10. ROUTE DISCONTINUANCE.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—Amtrak shall not, by reason of any provision of this Act, including section 1, reduce the frequency of service on any line on which, as of May 1, 1985, three or fewer trains operate per week.

□ 1155

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORIO

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLORIO: Page 11, after line 25, add the following new section:

SEC. 11. UNSAFE FACILITIES.

Title VIII of the Rail Passenger Service Act (45 U.S.C. 641 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section: "SEC. 812. UNSAFE FACILITIES.

"(a) The Corporation, or the owner of any facility which presents a danger to the employees, passengers, or property of the Corporation, may petition the Secretary for assistance to the owner of such facility for relocation or other remedial measures to minimize or eliminate such danger under this section.

"(b) If the Secretary determines that—

"(1) a facility which is the subject of a petition under subsection (a) presents a danger of death or serious injury to any employee or passenger of the Corporation or serious damage to any property of the Corporation; and

"(2) the owner of such facility should not be expected to bear the cost of relocating or other remedial measures necessary to minimize or eliminate such danger, the Secretary shall recommend to the Congress that the Congress, as a part of its periodic reauthorizations of this Act, authorize funding, by reimbursement or otherwise, for such relocation or other remedial measures.

"(c) Petitions may be submitted under subsection (a) of this section with respect to any relocation or remedial measures undertaken on or after January 1, 1978."

Mr. FLORIO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. The amendment is virtually identical to the amendment that was adopted by the House about 2 weeks ago on the rail safety bill and merely provides a procedure whereby petitions may be submitted to the Secretary of Transportation for assistance in dealing with safety problems associated with Amtrak.

If the Secretary satisfies herself that the costs of remedial action should be considered by this Congress, a recommendation will be made to the Congress. At that point the Congress is charged with the responsibility of evaluating the merits of the recommendation. I do not believe this is controversial.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FLORIO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LENT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the same one which was passed, as the gentleman indicated, during consideration of H.R. 5585, the Railroad Safety Improvement Act of 1984, and also H.R. 2372, the Railroad Safety Improvement Act of 1985. We have reviewed the amendment. The minority has no objection.

Mr. FLORIO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICHARDSON

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. RICHARDSON: Page 2, line 10, strike out "\$616,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$603,500,000".

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, which I believe is relatively uncontroversial, cleared by both sides, simply would reduce the authorized level of Amtrak by 11.5 percent consistent with the appropriations bill. The appropriations decision that was reached last week in the Department of Transportation appropriations, that is.

I believe that this is in line with fiscal responsibility. Let me just state for the record the importance that this Member feels, as the original author of this bill of Amtrak, as a rail passenger service, the outstanding qualities and services that it provides, and I believe that this is simply an amendment that brings us closer to fiscal responsibility.

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FLORIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's representation is correct. This amendment brings the authorization into conformity with the amount of money approved by this House. In the DOT appropriations bill. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LENT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand this amendment it does not actually reduce Amtrak's funding any further; that was done last week during consideration of the DOT appropriations bill. Obviously, Amtrak cannot spend more in Federal funds than are appropriated for it. So the gentleman's amendment is not objectionable. I have no objection.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is exactly correct in his representation.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding, and I stand to be corrected if I am wrong, that this is an amendment that cuts us back from the \$616 million in the committee bill to \$603.5 million which is the amount agreed to on the appropriations bill the other day. And I think that that is a substantive improvement. It certainly gets us in the direction that we ought to be going.

I must express, however, my disappointment that we are not going to have an amendment on the floor which goes to the \$582 million which was the implied budget figure.

I fully understand that we debated that. The gentleman from New Mexico who offered this amendment, in fact, offered that amendment on the floor the other day and it was defeated. So I can understand the need to come back to this figure.

But I do think it is important to recognize that we are engaged in a process here of an authorization following an appropriation and then taking the implied appropriation figure which just happens to be a figure above the implied budget figure as being the authorization figure.

You see what we are doing is, once again we are figuring out a way to slip around the budget process. That is my concern, that we are doing that day after day, in way after way, on the House floor.

I mean we are finding all kinds of mechanisms to get around the budget.

Now, there are a number of us who voted for that budget about 8 weeks ago, 6 or 8 weeks ago, who did not particularly like the budget. As a matter of fact, many of us recognized it to be a phony, that there were all kinds of phony figures in there, that the whole thing was a sham and that it was the only chance that we had of voting for anything that was going to try to target on some discipline in the House of Representatives. It was the only disciplinary tool we were going to get.

So therefore some of us voted for it as the only tool.

Now, despite the fact that it is a sham, despite the fact that the figures are phonies, we are finding ways on the House floor day after day, in way after way, to even violate the discipline that is in that budget.

The question has to be, how much longer are we going to allow this to go on without at least admitting to the American people that we are phonies, that this whole process is a total sham?

Because what we did in the budget on this particular program is, we said flatly in the budget, the implied amount in the budget was \$582 million. We are now going to authorize and appropriate a fund, an amount of money which is \$20 million above that amount.

And we are going to say throughout the process "that everything is within the budget, don't worry about it, and so on, we have figured out another way to get around the budget." Then someone else will bring a figure to the floor and we will say that that gets around the budget too.

And what that adds up to is that in the last 5 years Congress has overspent its own budgets by \$150 billion. That is how it is done. That is where deficits come from. We overspend our own budgets, and we do it very consciously, and we do it on individual bill after individual bill.

That is what we are doing here. We are going to cut back a little bit on the authorization, we are going to cut back from \$616 million to \$603.5 million, but we are not going to get down to the budget figure. In fact, this committee is in a bind because they have now found themselves in a situation where, if they went to the \$582 million, the \$582 million would not hold up anyway because we have already agreed to an appropriation which is a figure above that. So the House is put in a bind. The House cannot even get down to the \$582 million that a lot of people like myself would like to see us do. I contend that that is, in large part, the problem that is facing this country today. Deficits are not born; deficits are made. They are made right here in the House of Representatives on every occasion when we find a way around the Budget Act.

In this bill today we are finding another way around the Budget Act, and we are doing it to the detriment of this country because we are doing deficit add-on, and we do it consciously.

I intend to support the gentleman's amendment because it moves in the right direction. I do not intend, however, to support this legislation because it is a budget buster.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COATS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment, briefly.

Mr. Chairman, I do rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. As everyone knows, we discussed this in the appropriations process last week and arrived at a figure constituting approximately 1.4-percent reduction in funding for Amtrak. There was disagreement, frankly, as to whether we could have gone further or not. The House voted its will in that matter.

I think it is important to note, however, that those of us who do support national rail passenger service, those of us who do support Amtrak, need to pull together and continue to work together to find ways to make this a more efficient, more effective rail passenger service.

There are things that can be done to accomplish this. There are a number of things that were discussed in committee. There will be amendments offered later in this process to deal with some of those questions.

I would hope that we could continue the process of making this a leaner, more efficient national rail system because, given the budget reality of a \$200 billion deficit, spoken to by Mr. WALKER from Pennsylvania and others last week, it is critical that we examine every program that the Federal Government involves itself in and do whatever we can to make those programs more efficient.

Some of those programs probably will be eliminated. I do not believe this is one of them. Some of those programs need to be trimmed, made more efficient. Some of them need to be frozen. Some need to be increased; their demonstrated effectiveness is such that we may need to provide some increases.

In any event, I would hope all Members would scrutinize each piece of legislation to see where we could effect those savings and reduce the Federal deficit. I hope Members will be receptive to the efforts made here today, the efforts made in the Senate, and efforts that should be made on an ongoing basis to streamline Amtrak, to bring about reforms in programs that they are involved in, to make Amtrak a more efficient system.

Two examples of ways that Amtrak can reduce spending that I think we ought to give serious consideration to are: One, that Amtrak directly employ all its workers under the same rules that it presently employs workers in the Northeast corridor and on its Auto-Train. There is no reason why different rules should apply to one system; workers and employees for that system ought to be operating under the same rules.

I would hope we could move on that.

Second, we need to, I think, move forward with a proposal to allow Amtrak to transport unaccompanied motor vehicles on the Auto-Train. The first example can garner an estimated \$30 million per year, and the second example, nearly \$1 million per year, if we could just enact these two remedies.

There are others, and I will not take the time to discuss them now.

There are areas in labor contracts that can be adjusted, so that Amtrak can have a better handle on its spending.

Now, Mr. RICHARDSON's amendment is a good one, because even though it does not go as far as some of us would have liked, it does move us in the direction that we ought to go and need to go in terms of saving some money and yet retaining Amtrak as a national rail passenger system.

So I would urge my colleagues to endorse this, to effect this savings and then continue to work together to find ways to make this a more efficient system.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICHARDSON

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Richardson: Page 3, line 14, strike out "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof "seventeen".

Page 5, after line 20, insert the following: (M) A representative of Amtrak appointed by the President of Amtrak.

(N) A representative of the Office of Management and Budget appointed by the Director for such Office.

Page 6, line 5, strike out "Eight" and insert in lieu thereof "Nine".

Mr. RICHARDSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a relatively noncontroversial amendment which I believe has been cleared by the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member.

What it would do is simply in the commission that is established in the Amtrak authorization bill, a commission designed to study alternative funding options and many other initiatives such as the gentleman, Mr. COATS from Indiana, mentioned, in this commission, my amendment would simply add 2 additional representatives to that 15-member commission. It would add a representative from Amtrak, and it would add a representative from the Office of Management and Budget. I believe this is a good addition to this commission. I especially want to thank my colleague, Mr. COATS from Indiana, for his outstanding support and leadership in this bill.

My amendments will do the following:

First, change the funding level from \$616 million to \$603.5 million. You are doing this to make it consistent with the DOT 12 percent appropriation.

Second, add two representatives to the study Commission—an Amtrak representative and an OMB representative. One would be appointed by the President of Amtrak, the other by the Director of OMB. The quorum numbers, will be changed from eight to nine because of the addition of two study commission members. Study Commission members are not paid, they are only reimbursed for expenses. The chairman of the Commission is elected by the members. The Commission is authorized \$1 million. The Commission must transmit its initial report to Congress by March 30, 1986.

The membership is balanced: two State legislators, two members from National Rail Passengers Association, one Senator, one Congressman, two State transportation officials, one DOT representative, one rail labor representative, one rail freight representative, two commuter authorities, one bus industry representative, and one private sector representative.

My bill:

First, reauthorizes Amtrak for 1 year.

Second, includes an Amtrak Study Commission to improve performance of Amtrak and search for alternative sources of funding. Mrs. Dole clearly illustrated the need for this at hearings—there are many alternatives for Amtrak but it was apparent at the hearings that they had not been carefully examined. Before we can consider dramatic cuts we must study the impacts and the alternatives comprehensive plan which includes such things as those recommended by Mr. COATS of Indiana.

Third, sets a goal of improving revenue-to-cost ratio to 61 percent.

Fourth, urges labor contract negotiations to result in savings.

Fifth, allows Amtrak to participate in the Contract Air Program—making Federal travel on Amtrak eligible for reimbursement.

Mr. COATS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for making this initial suggestion and offering this amendment. This is one of those steps that I think we need to take, and this will hopefully provide us with the kind of information we need so that we can effectively move Amtrak forward and bring about those efficiencies needed to continue nationwide rail passenger service.

I am happy to be able to support the amendment of the gentleman.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LENT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the author of the amendment, the gentleman from New Mexico, if the addition of these two people to the study Commission will require any additional Federal funds to be authorized.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No, it would not. The only thing it would change would be the number of members that would constitute a quorum. Previously it was eight, and it will now be nine.

There will be no change whatsoever in the funding.

Mr. LENT. I think that the amendment of the gentleman is a good one. I would certainly hope that the representative of Amtrak to be added to the Commission might be someone of the caliber of Mr. Graham Claytor, the president of Amtrak.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would agree with that. I think he would be a fine addition. He has the option of appointing himself. The president of Amtrak appoints the Amtrak representative, and the Director of OMB appoints the OMB representative.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1210

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EVANS OF ILLINOIS

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EVANS of Illinois: At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 11. EMPLOYMENT VACANCY FILING.

(a) LIABILITY.—Section 704(c) of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 (45 U.S.C. 797c(c)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "VACANCY NOTICES.—"; and

(2) by adding at the end a new paragraph as follows:

"(2)(A) As soon as the Board becomes aware of any failure on the part of a railroad to comply with paragraph (1) the Board shall issue a warning to such railroad of its potential liability under subparagraph (B).

"(B) Any railroad failing to comply with paragraph (1) of this subsection after being warned by the Board under subparagraph (A) shall be liable for a civil penalty in the amount of \$1,000 for each vacancy with respect to which such railroad has so failed to comply."

(b) EXTENSION.—Section 704(f) of such Act (45 U.S.C. 797c(f)) is amended by striking out "4-year" and inserting in lieu thereof "6-year".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and the amendment made by subsection (b) shall be effective as of August 1, 1985.

Mr. EVANS of Illinois (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, today I am offering an amendment to the Amtrak authorization bill which is designed to protect the rights of unemployed railroad workers.

Under section 704 of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973, also known as the "3R Act," Congress ensured thousands of railroad workers certain right-of-first-hire protections. These preferential hiring protections require the Railroad Retirement Board to maintain a list of unemployed railroad workers in order to promote the placement of those workers who possess the requisite skills and experience in appropriate positions with other railroads.

The railroads, in turn, are required to timely file with the Board any position vacancies for which the railroad intends to accept applications from workers other than the railroad's own employees.

This arrangement should work out well—railroads report the job vacancies to the Board. And the Board forwards to the railroad a list of eligible and capable workers seeking jobs.

But there's a problem: What happens if the railroad fails to report job vacancies to the Board?

Under current law, absolutely nothing happens. The Board has no statutory authority to enforce the reporting requirements Congress so clearly mandated in section 704 of the 3R Act.

My amendment is a simple, straightforward attempt to correct this situation. It first extends for 2 years the requirement to maintain the registry of former railroad workers seeking a job. This requirement expired just this past August.

Second, it directs the Railroad Retirement Board to issue an official warning to any railroad found guilty of a first violation of the job reporting requirement contained in section 704(c) of the act. Following such a warning, any railroad found guilty of a second or subsequent violation of the law would be subject to a civil fine. This penalty would amount to \$1,000 for each job vacancy not reported to the Board.

This amendment is a fair, reasonable solution to a very real problem. The Railroad Retirement Board has informed me that it believes most railroads do comply with the job reporting requirements. If this is so, my amendment will pose no threat or financial hardship to the law-abiding railroads.

But I have evidence, which I present to the distinguished chairman of the Commerce, Transportation and Tourism Subcommittee, Mr. FLORIO, that violations of the law have occurred. On such occasions, Congress should not be silent.

We must make it known that when a law is violated, appropriate sanctions will be imposed. If no appropriate enforcement mechanism exists, any law we pass is meaningless.

I would like to note that a similar amendment, when offered to the Amtrak authorization last Congress, passed by voice vote. However, as you know, the House-passed bill never received final action.

I urge my colleagues to support this simple, fair and reasonable amendment to ensure that the rights Congress awarded unemployed railroad workers are adequately protected.

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Chairman, we have reviewed the amendment. The amendment is desirable, and we are prepared to support it.

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his concerns.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the gentleman if this is not similar to the amendment offered and passed by the House last Congress, during consideration of H.R. 3648, the Amtrak Improvement Act of 1983. It would appear to be so.

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. The gentleman is correct; however, that particular amendment was not enacted in subsequent legislation by the Senate.

Mr. LENT. This amendment would extend section 704(c) for an additional 2 years, and it would also add to that section a requirement that the Railroad Retirement Board issue a warning to any rail carrier who fails to file a job vacancy notice with the Board, and the penalty would be imposed on any carrier which violates the requirement the second time. Is that correct?

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois has a great deal of merit and we are going to support it.

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank both the chairman and the ranking member for their consideration and concern, and yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS.)

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RINALDO

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RINALDO: Page 11, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 12. TRANSPORTATION OF UNOCCUPIED VEHICLES.

Section 103(3) of the Rail Passenger Service Act (45 U.S.C. 502(3)) is amended by inserting "and, when space is available, of unoccupied vehicles" after "and their occupants".

Mr. RINALDO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to the Rail Passenger Service Act which would authorize Amtrak to transport unaccompanied vehicles on its auto train operation.

Amtrak took over the Auto-Train which runs from Lorton, VA, to Seward, FL, on October 1, 1983. It has met with remarkable success increasing its frequency of operation from 3

to 7 days a week, and more than doubling its revenue from this service over the last 2 years.

Yet, the full potential of this enterprise cannot be recognized because of provisions in the law which prohibit unattended vehicles from being transported by Auto-Train. In practical terms this means that during the late fall and early winter when southbound traffic is at full capacity, the train returns North almost empty. This occurs despite the fact that many car rental companies have sought permission to use this space at a significant fee to Amtrak.

The railroad has stated that it will transport these vehicles on a space-available basis. This would mean that current users would not be inconvenienced, and thousands of others who would like to avail themselves of this service but have been prohibited from doing so because of the law could be accommodated.

Amtrak has been financially squeezed over the past few years because of reduced Federal aid. However, it has shown that even under those conditions, it can provide quality service.

This Congress must assist and give them the capability of better utilizing their resources. I believe that my amendment is a step in that direction, and urge my colleagues to join me in support of this revenue-raising measure.

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RINALDO. I yield to the gentleman, from New Jersey.

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to support the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RINALDO]. I think it is a desirable amendment; I think it is key to appreciate the fact that what we are doing is providing the authority to Amtrak to become involved in this practice rather than mandating it.

I heard some of the comments earlier on different areas with suggestions being that we start mandating practices for Amtrak, allegedly to bring about efficiencies. I think we have got to be clear and careful that we do not intrude into the process of Amtrak. Over the last number of years we have tried to have the system operate in a business-like fashion, without political involvement in the management system; and that has resulted in some very good efficiencies.

The gentleman's amendment provides the authority to Amtrak to become involved in this practice; hopefully, if it generates revenues.

So I think the gentleman's amendment is a good one, and I am prepared to support it.

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FLORIO] for his support, and I completely agree with his

statement regarding political intrusion into the operation of Amtrak.

Mr. LENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RINALDO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COATS] earlier, during a colloquy on a previous amendment, indicated that it is really up to the Congress to find some ways, in working with Amtrak, to make this a more efficient and a more effective service.

I understand that Amtrak is successfully operating an Auto-Train now between Lorton, VA, and Sanford, FL, and while that Auto-Train is a revenue-generating venture, there are times when there is unused space in that train.

Would not the gentleman's amendment simply allow Amtrak to fill this available space with cars which are not accompanied by occupants?

Mr. RINALDO. The gentleman is correct. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, Amtrak has estimated that it could earn up to \$1 million in additional revenues each year if the restriction were removed. Associated expenses would be minimal, since the railroad is required to have in place not only its physical plant but also its operating personnel.

Mr. LENT. I want to commend the gentleman for this amendment. We have a bill before us, H.R. 2266, which actually reduces Amtrak's Federal funding. In this legislation Congress is asking Amtrak to increase its revenue-to-cost ratio and, thereby, decrease its reliance on the American taxpayer.

The initiative offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RINALDO] would assist Amtrak in its effort to achieve that goal, and I am pleased to be able to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. RINALDO. I want to thank my good friend for his support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RINALDO].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOLEY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOLEY: At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

SEC. 11. RAIL EMPLOYEE TAXES.

Section 11504(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) No part of the compensation paid by a rail carrier providing transportation subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission under subchapter I of chapter 105 of this title to an employee who performs his regular assigned duties as such an employee on a railroad in more

than one State, shall be subject to the income tax laws of any State or subdivision thereof other than a State or subdivision thereof described in paragraph (2) of this subsection."

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, this provision was included in the previous authorization bill with the generous support of the floor managers on the majority and minority sides and was passed accordingly by the House as part of that authorization.

Very briefly, it incorporates into the test of liability for taxes owed by railroad workers who operate in more than one State what we presently require for withholding purposes of State income taxes. Namely, that before a State other than that in which an individual resides can withhold State income taxes under Federal law, 50 percent of that individual's time or mileage must be spent in it.

As the situation stands, currently some States are trying to require railroad workers who do not reside within their borders but pass through them in the performance of their work to pay State their income tax.

Mr. FLORIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's arguments are equally persuasive today as they were last year when this House passed this amendment, and I am prepared to support the amendment.

Mr. LENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment, I believe the gentleman indicated, that was offered and passed by the House last Congress during consideration of H.R. 3648, the Amtrak Improvement Act of 1983. Is that correct?

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, I have no objections to this amendment.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2266, the Amtrak Reauthorization Act of 1985, as reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

This legislation represents a rational and fiscally responsible reauthorization of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation that will ensure the continued existence of viable passenger rail service in this country. Amtrak, since its inception in 1971, has proven to be an energy-efficient people mover. Despite any claims to the contrary, it is crucial that we continue this alterna-

tive transportation option. Our energy picture is not so rosy for us to begin abandoning or scaling-back effective conservation efforts such as this.

Amtrak is not only an efficient people mover, it is a very popular one. The Corporation's slogan, "America Is Into Training," is right on the mark. This year, by Amtrak estimates, will prove to be the third consecutive year of ridership increases with over 20.7 million passengers. It is also the fourth consecutive year passenger miles have increased and the system's revenue to operating cost ratio has improved. Many trains during the busy tourism season are running at or near capacity and Amtrak's on-time record continues to improve.

My home State of Vermont benefits greatly from Amtrak service. Amtrak's Montrealer offers an attractive alternative means of transportation to the greater metropolitan areas to our south for business and other purposes. The current schedule for the train allows Vermonters to travel overnight, ready for a full day at their final destination. In fact the popularity of the Montrealer among Vermonters was just recently made more apparent to me when it was announced that the train may be changed from a nighttime to a daytime schedule. This suggestion inspired quite a response from my constituents. The overwhelming reaction was that any change would significantly diminish the usefulness and attractiveness of the Montrealer. This feedback not only reinforced the support of Vermonters for Amtrak service but also the value of this service as a real transportation option.

Mr. Chairman, I support Mr. RICHARDSON's amendment to adjust the level of operating funds for Amtrak suggested in this legislation. This funding level represents approximately an 11.5-percent cut from last year's level. This is consistent with the House-passed transportation appropriations bill and according to Amtrak officials can be absorbed without any disruption of current services. It is very important that we maintain a national passenger rail system. Today's legislation with amendment responsibly provides effective funding for Amtrak while contributing to reducing our Federal deficit. I urge all my colleagues to support this initiative.

Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, today, as we debate Amtrak's authorization, I find myself in a difficult position. I fully support Amtrak, an essential component of the American transportation network. I am proud of the fact that East meets West in my district at Chicago Union Station. Over 20,000 hard-working men and women are employed by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

However, as chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Government Activities and Transportation, I have been overseeing Amtrak operations for more than 1 year. As an Amtrak supporter, I am sorry to say that Amtrak is a troubled Corporation. Last year, I was shocked to learn of the ease with which some of Amtrak's managers were able to undermine the procedural protections afforded unionized employees

accused of rule infractions. This year I learned that one of the same managers involved in several years of labor abuse was himself responsible for creating a slush fund in one of Amtrak's diesel facilities, a scheme undetected by the Corporation until unionized employees stepped forward. My subcommittee is now investigating newer areas where management accountability is dubious.

GAO is now reviewing Amtrak procurement and property control practices at the request of my subcommittee. My ranking subcommittee colleague, Mr. MCCANDLESS, and I made this request jointly. The subcommittee is meanwhile reviewing related aspects of this larger GAO project and will move ahead in this area in the coming months.

For the time being I urge all Members to support Amtrak legislation with an eye toward greatly increasing congressional oversight of this entity which we, in Congress, created. There are many management and union employees of Amtrak who yearn for greater congressional oversight because many of the problems within the Corporation have stagnated for years before they surfaced. Many of these employees believe that their Corporation will not survive unless Congress performs its oversight duties with even greater diligence.

Upon completion of my oversight, the Government Operations Committee will report to Congress its findings and recommendations. I earnestly hope Amtrak's next authorization will address the needed changes so that Federal subsidies of this Corporation may be better spent on passenger service. In the meantime I strongly urge passage of this appropriations legislation.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Amtrak authorization for fiscal year 1986, because a cutoff of Federal funds for Amtrak will have a terrible impact on our economy. The administration may believe that a cutoff of Amtrak funds is good for the Treasury, but the fact is it's bad for our economy. No Amtrak means no jobs. No Amtrak means more crowding of already overcrowded buses and planes. No Amtrak means trouble for railroad retirement.

This past summer we've witnessed a surge in train travel. This past July was the best July for Amtrak in the railroad's 14-year history. Ridership for 1985 appears certain to smash the 20 million mark. The volume of calls to Amtrak reservation centers this August was up 18 percent over last August. Now is not the time to abandon Amtrak. The administration's proposal to eliminate funding for Amtrak is not justifiable when one considers the effectiveness of the program or the value of the service Amtrak provides.

It's a fact that the administration's proposal would result in the cessation of all Amtrak service on October 1, 1985. This would mean the end of national intercity rail passenger service, and it would result in scrapping most of Amtrak's assets, substantial unemployment, and a potential

Federal labor protection liability of \$2.1 billion.

This bill provides \$616 million for Amtrak in fiscal year 1986, and creates a commission to study ways to make Amtrak self-sufficient. This approach provides a downpayment on the deficit, while protecting the vital service of Amtrak.

Over the last few weeks I've heard from hundreds of individuals from all economic groups. Each person has said that Amtrak is vital to them because it provides safe, affordable, reliable transportation. They want to keep Amtrak and so do I.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2266, a bill providing for the authorization of Amtrak for fiscal year 1986.

As a Member of Congress from Massachusetts, which State contains the northern terminus of Amtrak's Northeast corridor, I have followed Amtrak's progress with great interest since its humble origins in 1971. As the cochairman of the New England Congressional Caucus, which was formed in part to deal with the problem of preserving rail service in the face of the northeastern railroad bankruptcies, and as a member of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, I have constantly fought to provide Amtrak with the resources needed to preserve and improve rail passenger service in this country.

Amtrak has made dramatic improvements during the past 14 years in its on-time performance, its operating efficiency, and its revenue to cost ratio. Amtrak's level of subsidy has steadily decreased, and it has met or exceeded the revenue to cost ratio requirements that the Congress has set for it.

As I indicated last week during our debate on the fiscal year 1986 Transportation appropriations bill, it would be a transportation policy disaster, and a penny-wise, pound-foolish fiscal error, to cut Amtrak off just as it seems to be coming into its own. Ridership figures from my district, in western Massachusetts, indicate that Amtrak is increasingly popular, and I am sure that its performance will continue to improve if we do not make inappropriate cuts in its level of funding.

Although I would have preferred to see the continuation of Amtrak funding at last year's level, I believe that the 10-percent cut called for in this bill, to a level of \$616 million, is one that will permit Amtrak to continue its operations at an acceptable level. Last week the House rejected, by a vote of 173 to 245, an effort to make a 15-percent cut in Amtrak funding. I trust that represents a sufficient indication of congressional support for Amtrak, and urge the adoption of this bill at the reported authorization level.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2266, the Amtrak authorization bill of 1985.

Mr. Chairman, Amtrak provides a vital service to the Nation. We are all familiar with the attempts by this administration to eliminate Federal funding for Amtrak—fortunately, most of us don't support them.

We are all looking at ways to streamline Federal programs and cut back on nonessential services—Amtrak, however, does not fall into the nonessential category.

Twenty million people depend on Amtrak each year—many of them are elderly or cannot fly. Amtrak serves many communities which have no access to other forms of public transportation. It serves 161 communities which have no air service, 52 communities with no bus service and 29 communities with neither bus nor air service. In the event of a national emergency, Amtrak would be able to carry almost 76,000 military personnel, supplementing additional military mobilization plans.

There is strong support in the Congress for Amtrak. We recognize its importance to the national transportation network. H.R. 2266 will ensure the survival of passenger rail service in the country. It is also a fiscally responsible bill—it includes a 10-percent cut from the 1985 funding level and I will be offering an amendment today to reduce it further, in line with the amount appropriated in the DOT appropriation. In addition, H.R. 2266, while recognizing that cuts can and must be made in Federal programs, provides protections against loss of services and routes by requiring that "unless sufficient funds are otherwise available to operate the corporation's rail system at substantially the same level of service, maintenance and equipment overhauls, funds appropriated for nonoperational capital projects shall be used to maintain" current levels of service. Finally, and extremely important to Western and rural States like my home State of New Mexico, lines served by three or fewer trains per week, are prohibited from reductions in service.

While no one supports a balanced budget more than I, I also believe that the rail passenger service provided by Amtrak is vital to our economy, to our security, and to our national health and well-being. I do not advocate unlimited and indiscriminate funding, of rail passenger service—in fact, I advocate just the opposite. With H.R. 2266, I am advocating judicious use of the Federal dollar, congressional willingness to save taxpayer's money, the need to cut back Amtrak funding and serious examination of alternative sources of funding for Amtrak through an Amtrak study commission. Nonetheless, I believe rail passenger service to be important to the future of our country—and congressional support of Amtrak to be important to the future of rail passenger service.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of Amtrak and H.R. 2266.

□ 1220

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any further amendments to the bill? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BENNETT, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2266) authorizing appropriations for Amtrak for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, establishing a commission to study the financial status of Amtrak, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 263, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, it would be my intention to ask for a recorded vote on the final passage of this bill. However, it has come to my attention that the electronic voting system that we typically use in the House of Representatives is not functioning, and under the rule XV, clause 5, the Speaker does in fact have the discretion to have the vote be by rollcall vote of the Members rather than by electronic means.

It is my reading that the intent of the Constitution and the intent of the rules of this House is to assure that Members of Congress, when casting their vote, do so wholly in public so that the Member's vote is in fact known to the public at the time he or she casts that vote.

It seems to me that if we have an electronic voting system which is not giving the American people that opportunity to understand the votes of their Representatives at the time that vote is cast that we ought to revert to the system that is the underlying system of the House of a voice vote, which in fact that record the Member's vote precisely that way. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that under the discretion given the Chair in rule XV, the Chair exercise that particular authority with regard to the upcoming vote.

The SPEAKER. In response to the gentleman, the Chair would state that the Chair by utilizing the electronic system is following precedent of June 1, 1977, June 21, 1978, July 18, 1979,

October 21, 1981, and September 18, 1985. So there are several precedents.

The Constitution requires that the yeas and nays be spread upon the Journal, and that is what the rules of the House have always guaranteed, both prior to and subsequent to electronic voting. Consequently, the Chair believes that the proper method is being used and that there are precedents therefor.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote will be taken by electronic device.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair has been advised that while the electronic display panels are not working, all voting stations are operating. The Chair will direct that all vote-monitoring stations be staffed with personnel so that any Member may go to another monitor and verify his or her vote.

Members may also verify their votes, as they should on any vote, by reinserting their card at the same or at another voting station.

The Chair has now been informed that the voting stations are not working. The House will revert to a standby procedure.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 290, nays 128, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 313]

YEAS—290

Ackerman	Brooks	Dellums
Akaka	Brown (CA)	Derrick
Alexander	Bruce	DeWine
Anderson	Burton (CA)	Dicks
Andrews	Bustamante	Dingell
Annunzio	Byron	DioGuardi
Anthony	Campbell	Dixon
Applegate	Carney	Donnelly
Aspin	Carper	Dorgan (ND)
Atkins	Carr	Dowdy
AuCoin	Chapman	Downey
Barnes	Chappell	Durbin
Bateman	Chapple	Dwyer
Bates	Clay	Dymally
Bedell	Clinger	Dyson
Beilenson	Coats	Early
Bennett	Coelho	Eckart (OH)
Bentley	Coleman (TX)	Edgar
Berman	Collins	Edwards (CA)
Biaggi	Conte	Emerson
Boehlert	Conyers	Erdreich
Boggs	Coughlin	Evans (IA)
Boland	Courter	Evans (IL)
Boner (TN)	Coyne	Fascell
Bonior (MI)	Crockett	Fazio
Bonker	Darden	Feighan
Borski	Daschle	Florio
Bosco	Daub	Foglietta
Boucher	Davis	Foley
Boxer	de la Garza	Ford (MI)

Fowler	Markey	Scheuer
Frank	Marlenee	Schneider
Frost	Martin (NY)	Schroeder
Gallo	Martinez	Schulze
Garcia	Matsui	Schumer
Gaydos	Mavroules	Seiberling
Gejdenson	Mazzoli	Sharp
Gekas	McCloskey	Shelby
Gephardt	McCollum	Shuster
Gilman	McDade	Sikorski
Glickman	McGrath	Sisisky
Gonzalez	McHugh	Skeltton
Gordon	McKinney	Slattery
Gray (IL)	Mica	Slaughter
Green	Mikulski	Smith (FL)
Guarini	Miller (CA)	Smith (IA)
Hall (OH)	Mineta	Smith (NE)
Hall, Ralph	Mitchell	Smith (NJ)
Hamilton	Moakley	Smith, Robert
Hammerschmidt	Molinaro	Solarz
Hatcher	Mollohan	Solomon
Hawkins	Montgomery	Spence
Hayes	Moody	Spratt
Hefner	Morrison (CT)	St Germain
Heftel	Mrazek	Staggers
Henry	Murphy	Stallings
Hertel	Murtha	Stangeland
Hillis	Myers	Stokes
Holt	Natcher	Stratton
Horton	Nichols	Studds
Howard	Nowak	Stump
Hoyer	O'Brien	Synar
Hughes	Oakar	Tallon
Hutto	Olin	Tauke
Jacobs	Ortiz	Tauzin
Jeffords	Panetta	Taylor
Jenkins	Parris	Thomas (GA)
Johnson	Pashayan	Torres
Jones (NC)	Pease	Torricelli
Kanjorski	Penny	Towns
Kaptur	Pepper	Traficant
Kastenmeier	Perkins	Traxler
Kennelly	Petri	Udall
Kildee	Pickle	Vento
Kindness	Price	Visclosky
Kiecicka	Pursell	Volkmer
Kolter	Rahall	Walgren
Kostmayer	Rangel	Waxman
LaFalce	Ray	Weaver
Lantos	Regula	Weiss
Leach (IA)	Reid	Wheat
Lehman (FL)	Richardson	Whittaker
Leland	Rinaldo	Whitten
Lent	Ritter	Williams
Levin (MI)	Robinson	Wilson
Levine (CA)	Rodino	Wirth
Lewis (CA)	Roe	Wise
Lightfoot	Rose	Wolf
Lipinski	Rostenkowski	Wolpe
Lloyd	Roukema	Wortley
Lowry (WA)	Rowland (CT)	Wright
Lujan	Rowland (GA)	Wyden
Luken	Roybal	Wylie
Lundine	Russo	Yates
MacKay	Sabo	Yatron
Madigan	Savage	Young (MO)
Manton	Saxton	

NAYS—128

Archer	Dannemeyer	Hartnett
Armey	DeLay	Hendon
Badham	Dickinson	Hiler
Barnard	Dornan (CA)	Hopkins
Bartlett	Dreier	Hubbard
Barton	Duncan	Huckaby
Bereuter	Eckert (NY)	Hunter
Billakis	Edwards (OK)	Hyde
Billey	English	Ireland
Boulter	Fawell	Jones (TN)
Breaux	Fiedler	Kasich
Broomfield	Fields	Kemp
Brown (CO)	Fish	Kolbe
Broyhill	Flippo	Kramer
Burton (IN)	Ford (TN)	Lagomarsino
Callahan	Franklin	Latta
Chandler	Frenzel	Leath (TX)
Cheney	Fuqua	Lewis (FL)
Cobey	Gibbons	Livingston
Coble	Gingrich	Loeffler
Coleman (MO)	Goodling	Lott
Combust	Gradison	Lowery (CA)
Cooper	Gregg	Lungren
Craig	Grotberg	Mack
Crane	Gunderson	Martin (IL)
Daniel	Hansen	McCain

McCandless	Packard	Stenholm
McCurdy	Porter	Strang
McEwen	Quillen	Sundquist
McKernan	Roberts	Sweeney
McMillan	Roemer	Swindall
Meyers	Rogers	Thomas (CA)
Michel	Schaefer	Valentine
Miller (OH)	Schuetz	Vander Jagt
Miller (WA)	Sensenbrenner	Vucanovich
Monson	Shaw	Walker
Moore	Shumway	Watkins
Moorhead	Siljander	Weber
Morrison (WA)	Skeen	Whitehurst
Neal	Smith (NH)	Whitley
Nelson	Smith, Denny	Young (AK)
Nielson	Snowe	Young (FL)
Oxley	Snyder	Zschau

NOT VOTING—15

Addabbo	Long	Rudd
Bevill	Oberstar	Stark
Bryant	Obey	Swift
Gray (PA)	Owens	
Jones (OK)	Ridge	
Lehman (CA)	Roth	

□ 1255

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing appropriations for Amtrak for fiscal year 1986, establishing a commission to study the financial status of Amtrak, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2266, AMTRAK REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2266, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending that bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WISE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter therein, on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, because it was necessary for me to attend a conference of the West Virginia Housing Authority in my congressional dis-

trict last evening, September 18, 1985, I unavoidably missed the following votes: roll Nos. 310, 311, and 312. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on roll Nos. 310 and 311 and "yea" on roll No. 312.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD PRINTING OF AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2100, FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 1985

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by the chairman of the Rules Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], to advise the Members that the Rules Committee would incorporate in the rule to provide for consideration of H.R. 2100, the farm bill, a provision that all amendments to H.R. 2100 be printed in the RECORD prior to the close of business on Tuesday. I might inform the Members that we did not request this per se, but it is the intention of the Rules Committee to make this provision for orderly consideration in regard to the budget process.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON H.R. 2100

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight to file a privileged report on H.R. 2100.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take this time for the purpose of asking a couple of questions of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Just so that the Members will once again be reassured on the schedule for Friday, I wonder if the gentleman from South Carolina can confirm once again that on tomorrow, Friday, there will only be votes on two rules and then general debate, and there will not be any votes on substantive amendments to the farm bill out of the Agriculture Committee?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is my understanding.

□ 1310

Mr. DERRICK. That is my understanding.

Mr. LOTT. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding also. We do not know yet if the general debate will be two hours plus something for the Merchant Marine Committee on another

issue, but my understanding is that we are to proceed no further.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman give us information on the rule? Will it be basically an open rule, subject to amendment, and will there not be any limitation, time limitation, on the specific titles or the amendments?

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DERRICK. Well, Mr. Speaker, I cannot guarantee that. We have not taken it up, but it is my understanding that there will be no time limitation, that is correct.

Mr. LOTT. So it will be an open rule, so that amendments would be in order.

Mr. DERRICK. That is what has been requested by the Agriculture Committee and as I perceive it, that is what we will do, although I cannot give the gentleman an absolute guarantee.

Mr. LOTT. That is the intent of the Rules Committee at this time?

Mr. DERRICK. That is right.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me under his reservation?

Mr. LOTT. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman could find out whether or not there might be any budget waivers contemplated on the rule on the Agriculture bill.

Mr. LOTT. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina on budget waivers. I do not recall any being requested.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the Agriculture Committee is within the overall limit. We do not anticipate any budget waivers.

Mr. WALKER. There are no—either technical waivers or substantive waivers contemplated?

Mr. LOTT. I am advised by counsel that there may be a need for a waiver because of the entitlement provisions of some of the farm bill.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, so we are likely to have a situation on the floor tomorrow where we would be waiving the entitlement section of the Budget Act once again, as we have last week at one point?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is my understanding that the Rules Committee will probably give a waiver on sections 303(a), 402(a), and 401(a).

Mr. WALKER. That does include the entitlement section?

Mr. DERRICK. It does.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK]?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3248, ARTS, HUMANITIES, AND MUSEUMS AMENDMENTS OF 1985

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-276) on the resolution (H. Res. 266) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3248) to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

EXPRESSING SOLIDARITY WITH THE SAKHAROV FAMILY

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 62) expressing solidarity with the Sakharov family in their efforts to exercise their rights of freedom of expression, of travel, and of communication, as guaranteed them under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take this time to afford the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the subcommittee, an opportunity to explain the purpose of the resolution.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 62 which expresses solidarity with the Sakharov family in their efforts to exercise their rights under various U.N. instruments and human rights agreements signed by the Soviet Union.

What makes the passage of this resolution particularly important is the declining health of Dr. Andrei Sakharov and his wife, Dr. Yelena Bonner. Dr. Bonner is believed to be in dire need of medical attention which can only be provided in the West. Dr. Sakharov, a Nobel laureate, in response to his illegal incarceration and in an effort to embarrass his Soviet captors into releasing his wife, has undertaken a hunger strike.

Mr. Speaker, the plight of this brave couple is the most illustrative example of the Soviet Government's blatant disregard for basic standards of human rights. But these two people are among thousands of Soviet citizens who are denied their individual freedom and dignity. It is my hope that this resolution focuses worldwide attention on Dr. Andrei Sakharov and his wife. They fought so valiantly to preserve the rights of others, now it is up to us to do what we can to preserve theirs.

I want to commend the gentleman from New York, BEN GILMAN, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, BARNEY FRANK, for their leadership, dedication, and perseverance. They have fought valiantly on behalf of the Sakharovs, as they have for many others who have been denied their human rights throughout the world.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan at this point withdraw his reservation so we can yield him some time?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I would be happy to do that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 62

Whereas, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights guarantees to all the rights of freedom of thought, conscience, religion, opinion, and expression;

Whereas, this same Declaration states that "no one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention, or exile"; and that "no one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence";

Whereas, the Declaration further states that "everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each State"; and that "everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country";

Whereas, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights provides that "everyone lawfully within the territory of a State shall, within that territory, have the right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose his residence"; and that "everyone shall be free to leave any country, including his own"; and that "no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of the right to enter his own country";

Whereas, the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe provided that each of the "participating states will respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought (and) conscience . . . for all"; and recognized that all human rights "derive from the inherent dignity of the human person";

Whereas, this same Act pledged that the participating states would "deal in a positive

and a humanitarian spirit with the applications of persons who wish to be reunited with members of their family, with special attention being given to requests of an urgent character—such as requests submitted by persons who are ill or old”;

Whereas, the Act further commits participating states “to facilitate wider travel by their citizens for personal or professional reasons”;

Whereas, the Act specifically affirms the “right of the individual to know and act upon his rights and duties” under the agreement and affirms the positive role individuals play in the implementation of the Act;

Whereas, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics signed the Final Act of the Conference on Cooperation and Security in Europe, is a party to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and has ratified the International Covenant on Civil Political Rights;

Whereas, Nobel Laureate Andrei Sakharov, who, exercising his right as an individual to monitor compliance with the Final Act, had become a leader of the human rights movement in the Soviet Union, was arrested and exiled to Gorky in direct contravention of the above-mentioned human rights agreements;

Whereas, his wife Elena Bonner, as a result of her efforts to exercise her right of self-expression, has been detained and charged with anti-Soviet agitation;

Whereas, Dr. Bonner is thought to be in urgent need of medical attention available only in the West;

Whereas, Dr. Sakharov is reported to have undertaken a hunger strike, to the point of endangering his health;

Whereas, communication between the Sakharovs in the Soviet Union and their children and stepchildren in the United States has been repeatedly interrupted, delayed, and tampered with by the Soviet authorities;

Whereas, the absence of reliable communications between the branches of the family has created serious doubt as to the state of well-being of Dr. Sakharov and Dr. Bonner;

Whereas, Mr. Alexei Semyonov, the stepson of Dr. Sakharov and the son of Dr. Bonner, has embarked on a hunger strike to dramatize the plight of his family and to protest the cruel obstruction of his efforts to communicate with his loved ones;

Whereas, Mr. Semyonov has demanded a visitor's visa to visit the Soviet Union so that he can reassure himself with his own eyes that his parents are alive and well; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that, in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Soviet Union should drop all charges against Dr. Elena Bonner, restore to her and Dr. Andrei Sakharov the full rights to travel (domestic and international) and free expression, allow unimpeded correspondence between them and their relatives and friends in the West, and allow Alexei Semyonov permission to visit them in the Soviet Union.

SEC. 2. The Congress urges the President—

(1) to protest, in the strongest possible terms and at the highest levels, the blatant and repeated violations of the Sakharov's rights by the Soviet authorities, and

(2) to call upon all other signatory nations of the Final Act of the Conference on Security

and Cooperation in Europe to join in such protests.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit copies of this resolution to the Ambassador of the Soviet Union to the United States and to the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my support for the concurrent resolution before us today. This timely and important resolution expresses solidarity with the Sakharov family in their efforts to exercise their rights to freedom of expression, of travel, and of communication.

The routine violation of human rights in the Soviet Union is a matter which is of great importance to our Government. It is an issue which I am sure will be raised at the upcoming meeting in Geneva between our President and the Soviet leaders.

As we all know, these rights are guaranteed to the Sakharovs under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Helsinki Final Act. In this day and age, most self-respecting countries honor these basic human freedoms.

The plight of the Sakharov family is a tragic one which all Americans should know about. In violation of the provisions of these important international acts guaranteeing individuals basic freedoms, the Sakharovs are routinely being denied those freedoms which all of us here today take for granted.

These innocent human beings have been exiled, and are consistently subjected to arbitrary interference with the privacy of their home and their correspondence. They have been denied the right to leave the Soviet Union, and cannot move freely in their own country.

Even though the Soviet Government signed the Helsinki accords, the human rights of the Sakharovs are violated on a daily basis. The Kremlin brazenly ignores its commitments to the provision of the accords. Doctor Sakharov's health is frail and his wife has been denied badly needed medical treatment overseas. Their efforts to communicate with their children are obstructed in a cruel and harsh manner. Their stepson has even been denied a visa to visit his family in the Soviet Union.

Given this massive violation of the basic human rights of this innocent family, I join my colleagues in calling upon the Soviet Union to drop charges against Yelena Bonner and give the

family the right to travel both inside their country and overseas. It is also necessary that Soviet officials allow open communications between the Sakharovs and their family in the West.

I urge the President to strongly protest these blatant and cruel violations of the Sakharov's basic human rights. Our Government should also call upon other nations to join in such protests.

As we approach the day when President Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev meet in Geneva, I urge the administration to raise this critical issue of human rights violations in the Soviet Union with the Soviet leader. Human rights is an important issue which must be resolved. It is one of many issues over which we have major differences of opinion with the Soviets. It is one of many problems which remains to be resolved between our two countries. While arms control is important, human rights and other vital subjects must also be discussed.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important resolution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Yes, I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and I commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], for his leadership on this issue.

The continuing plight of Andrei Sakharov is a pathetic commentary on human rights conditions within the Soviet Union today. In any other country, Andrei Sakharov and his wife, Yelena Bonner, would be held up for the highest of national honors and public recognition for their manifold attainments in the disciplines of science, philosophy, and ethics. As it is, however, the Sakharovs are treated officially as nonpersons, exiles in their own land.

As we consider this resolution, it is worthwhile to remember the citation that accompanied Dr. Sakharov's Nobel Peace Prize in 1975. The final paragraph reads:

Sakharov's love of truth and strong belief in the inviolability of the human being, his fight against violence and brutality, his courageous defense of the freedom of the spirit, his unselfishness and strong humanitarian convictions have turned him into the spokesman for the conscience of mankind, which the world so sorely needs today.

So in passing this resolution today, we will be honoring a very gifted man who is also an eminent humanitarian. And we will also be adding our voice—the voice of the American people—to an international chorus of outrage—the voice of humanity itself expressing its indignation and revulsion at the way in which the Soviet authorities have treated Dr. Sakharov and his wife. All of the hypocrisy behind Mr.

Gorbachev's smiles and expressions of good will stands exposed before a candid world. When the foremost advocate of peace and human rights in the world today languishes in isolation and exile, the sincerity and intentions of the Soviet leadership must be seriously questioned and challenged on every count.

The Soviets may succeed in breaking Dr. Sakharov's body, but they will never break his mind and spirit. Let us keep faith with him today by passing this resolution unanimously.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 62, expressing solidarity with the Sakharov family in their efforts to exercise their rights of freedom of expression, of travel, and of communication, as guaranteed them under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. This resolution is identical to House Concurrent Resolution 186, which was introduced in the House by the Honorable BARNEY FRANK and BENJAMIN A. GILMAN. I would like to commend our colleagues for their sponsorship of this important resolution.

Once again we are compelled to consider a resolution on behalf of the Sakharovs. The chronic and deplorable plight of this family has persisted for years. This resolution is an expression of hope that there may be some change in the Soviet attitude toward and treatment of the Sakharovs, and of all its citizens. We sincerely hope that there may be some positive breakthrough in the Sakharovs' situation. We strongly urge compassionate and humane treatment by the Soviets toward these prominent citizens, and call upon the President to protest the blatant and repeated violations of the Sakharovs' rights.

Dr. Sakharov, the Nobel Peace Prize laureate, was exiled in January 1980, to the closed city of Gorky for his human rights activities and for criticizing the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. His wife Yelena Bonner, a founding member of the Moscow Helsinki Monitoring Group, was arrested and charged with anti-Soviet agitation after freely expressing her views—a fundamental right to which the Soviets subscribe under international documents. The physical well-being of Sakharov and Bonner is in serious question. Their already fragile health was further jeopardized by repeated hunger strikes to protest their condition. Both are thought to need urgent medical attention. Alexei Semyonov, Sakharov's stepson and Bonner's son

who lives in the United States, recently undertook a hunger strike to protest the treatment of his parents and the denial of their basic rights. Not only have the Soviets blocked communications among the family members, they have denied Semyonov a visa to visit his parents in the Soviet Union.

As the Reagan-Gorbachev summit approaches, it is appropriate for the Congress to reaffirm the strong American commitment to human rights issues. Unfortunately, present Soviet attitudes toward the Sakharovs are indicative of their disregard for human rights concerns. However, the Soviet leadership is now afforded an excellent opportunity to demonstrate its interest in improving relations between our two countries by allowing the Sakharovs to exercise their basic human rights. Such action would certainly enhance the climate for the summit.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 62.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], a sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. FASCELL, as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] who in his capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights has been very helpful in moving House Concurrent Resolution 186 to the floor quickly. Their assistance today is highly appreciated, especially since the other body acted on an identical measure (S. Con. Res. 62) last week.

The House resolution—H. Con. Res. 186—which was introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and myself, was in response to the deteriorating situation surrounding the health, welfare, and safety of Nobel Peace Prize winner Dr. Andrei Sakharov and his wife, Dr. Yelena Bonner. For over 5 years, this noted scientist and former Helsinki Watch Monitor has been isolated in the closed Soviet city of Gorky, serving a 5-year sentence of internal exile which is totally unfounded and which has now been extended by Dr. Bonner being sentenced to exile as Dr. Sakharov's term was ending. As a devout couple, this means that both are in exile together. More alarming is the lack of telephonic and postal communications; always poor, these vital links were virtually cutoff in the last 9 months. Since this spring, Dr. Sakharov's stepson, Alexei Semyonov, has only received two postcards from his parents.

Alexei Semyonov initially contacted me through the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] because he suspected that one of his parents' postcards had been tampered with. This bears out what our ongoing inves-

tigation of the Soviet mail had suspected, and is further proof that the Soviet Union systematically hampers delivery of letters and parcels going to and from the Soviet Union.

Drs. Sakharov and Bonner disappeared from their apartment in Gorky early this past summer; we have no concrete knowledge as to their current health or well-being. Dr. Bonner has needed medical care only available in the West for quite some time, and Dr. Sakharov's health is also frail. The only reports we have had to date of their status are some films produced by the Soviets purporting to show Dr. Sakharov alive and well. This is not proof enough that Drs. Sakharov and Bonner are healthy and well cared for.

What is needed is continued and close communication between parents and children. Alexei Semyonov and his sister, Tanya Yankelevitch, came to Washington recently, where Alexei began what was to be a 2-week long hunger strike near the Soviet Embassy. Although Congressman FRANK and I, along with several of our colleagues, met with Soviet Embassy officials in an attempt to learn about the Sakharov's health and well-being, we were told, "we do not have the authority to discuss this case." Our hand delivered letter to Ambassador Dobrynin was refused, and was subsequently mailed immediately following the meeting.

Alexei's hunger strike was a drastic measure. But this entire human rights situation is a drastic one. It was only after Alexei received assurances from the State Department that the highest priority would be given to American efforts on behalf of his parents that he ceased his hunger strike. However, he still desires to visit the Soviet Union to ascertain personally the health and whereabouts of his parents.

This resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 186, expresses the solidarity of Congress with the Sakharov family in these efforts, and by citing the international agreements and treaties to which the Soviet Union is signatory, urges the Soviet authorities to release the Sakharovs and allow free and unimpeded communication between members of the family. The measure also calls upon the President to protest, "in the strongest possible terms and at the highest levels, the blatant and repeated violations of the Sakharov's rights by the Soviet authorities." We call upon all other signatory nations to the Helsinki Final Act to convey their deepest concern to the Soviet Union about this deplorable situation, and to assure the Soviets that we will not cease in our efforts on behalf of Drs. Sakharov and Bonner. By adopting this resolution today, the Clerk of the House is required to transmit a copy of the bill to Ambassador Dobrynin in Washington, as well

as to Andre Gromyko, the new chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. I urge our colleagues to join us in this effort, and to continue to lend their support to Dr. Sakharov and Dr. Bonner and to all the refuseniks in the Soviet Union who are denied the basic freedom to emigrate.

□ 1325

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to commend the gentleman's sponsorship of this resolution, together with the other cosponsors and the chairman and the subcommittee chairman as well as the chairman of the full committee and the ranking member for bringing this resolution before us. I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for his statement.

I want to also point out that what we are dealing with today is another indication of the kind of an empire that the Soviet Union really is. While Dr. Sakharov has been afforded this very, very bad treatment that has been so well outlined here this afternoon, I think we should keep in mind that there are thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, I would suggest millions of people who have been similarly treated and will continue to be so treated as long as that regime follows its present course of action.

I commend the gentleman again and urge my colleagues to vote for the resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman from California for his supporting remarks and for being such a long-standing leader in the fight for human rights, and particularly for those rights that have been abused in the Soviet Union. And I thank our distinguished ranking member of our House Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for continuing in his efforts to keep this issue before the public.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman and thank him and also the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] for their leadership on this issue.

I would just like to point out that the gentleman from New York, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, and myself and three other Congressmen not long ago were down in front of the Soviet Embassy demonstrating on behalf of support of Mr. Semyenov, a constituent of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and the son of Andrei Sakharov.

What was really enlightening was when we were ushered into the Soviet

Embassy, and we had a chance to discuss the situation with two First Secretaries of the Embassy, the icy reception that we received, the Orwellian double talk, the stonewall of inhuman response is something that I think many Members of Congress would have benefited from that experience. It is not out of line to put this event not isolated from other events which show the Soviet Union to participate in the kinds of activities such as 007 and Afghanistan, and human rights violations of this ilk that extend to the tens, perhaps hundreds of thousands of people in the Soviet Union.

I commend the authors of the resolution. This resolution is really a symbol of so much other despair and oppression and repression of human rights that takes place in the Soviet Union today. I hope that this is the subject brought up by our own leaders at the Geneva Summit, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for his supporting remarks and for joining us at the Soviet Embassy. His description is quite accurate of the response we received. They had no authority to give us any information and refused to accept our petition, and then to tell us that in due time we might hear from them. To date none of us has ever received any response from the thousands of inquiries we make to the Soviet Embassy.

Mr. RITTER. If the gentleman would yield on that point, at one point we asked whether or not they could tell us whether Andrei Sakharov was alive or dead. The first response was "We don't know." The second response was "We are not authorized to say."

I think that is an educational experience for Members of this Congress.

I yield back to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for joining us today on this resolution and for being so supportive.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] one of the original sponsors of this resolution.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the chairs, the ranking minority members of both the full committee and subcommittee for acting so expeditiously on this very grave matter. It was part of the process by which a very courageous son, Alexei Semyonov, was persuaded to give up a hunger strike. All of us understand the anguish he feels when he sees his mother and stepfather, two people he deeply loves and respects, being tortured in a slow but methodical and ultimately destructive way, and understandably this young man, enjoying the freedom of this country, feels driven in the most dramatic and personal way possible to bear testimony on behalf of his mother and his father.

Our job here is to make clear, I hope, to the Soviet Union that our disagreements with them extend to several levels. Obviously there is a profound difference between us and them as to the very fundamentals of their system. They have a system which we find repugnant and none of us would want to live there.

But this resolution in itself is not aimed at that. We are not asking here for the Soviets to become a Western democracy, as desirable as many of us would like to see that. That is not necessary for us to be able with them to pursue common interests in arms reduction, in the stabilization of various hot spots in the world.

What we are saying is that an unnecessary brutalization of these two very distinguished and honorable people, and as has been pointed out, they are really representative of many, many others who are being punished, that does become an obstacle to good relations. Many of us feel that despite our profound rejection of the values on which the Soviet system is based, we can recognize our common reality in the world and work out some problems that may reduce tensions. But they make it harder by inflicting this wholly gratuitous pain on two distinguished and now helpless people.

What we are asking now is not that Andrei Sakharov and Yelena Bonner be appointed to the Politburo. We are not asking for fundamental change. We are asking that these two decent human beings be allowed the freedom of movement, be allowed to communicate with their loved ones and their friends, and that others similarly situated, whether they are being persecuted for religious reasons because they are Jewish, or for political reasons because they want freedom, that the Soviet Union at least allow these people the basic right of moving elsewhere, if nothing else will work.

I would like to see the whole system change, but something short of that is what we are asking here.

It was discouraging to go with my colleagues, and the gentleman from Washington is here, and the gentleman from Ohio, and the gentleman from Michigan as well as the others who have spoken, and to find so little response from the Soviet Union.

I hope that with the passage of this resolution unanimously, to match one that has been passed by the other body, that the President will again take up this at the summit, and that we may begin to get some humane response from the Soviet Union on behalf of these two people.

I want to again thank those, including the gentleman from New York, the cosponsor of this resolution, and the leadership of the committee for bringing this forward to us.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] who is also the cochairman of the Helsinki Commission.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Human Rights Subcommittee, and congratulate him for the work he has been doing. I thank him for his inclusion of the Helsinki Commission and the considerations that the Commission has been about.

I also thank the ranking member, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for his leadership not only on this issue, but on so many other human rights issues in which the Commission and the Congress are so concerned. Also my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for the work that he has done.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to join these gentlemen and the gentleman from Massachusetts, BARNEY FRANK, in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 62 and House Concurrent Resolution 186, expressing solidarity with the Sakharov family.

The son of Yelena Bonner, Andrei Sakharov's courageous stepson, Alexei Semyonov, of whom BARNEY FRANK just spoke, last week ended a 14-day hunger strike, a strike that brought attention to the plight of his mother and stepfather. He ended that hunger strike only after receiving assurances from the State Department that the Sakharov's quest for freedom would be a top priority of our Government.

By our actions today, we join in that commitment that the State Department has made.

I had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of visiting with Alexei Semyonov as he participated in that hunger strike. I visited him there on 16th Street in close proximity to the Russian Embassy. The travesty is, that his expression of that concern had to be carried to the extent of a hunger strike in order to gain the attention of his parents' jailers.

Alexei Semyonov has not heard from his parents in more than 4 months, Mr. Speaker. Conditions clearly are deteriorating more for them than at nearly any time since Andrei Sakharov was first committed to internal exile in Gorky in 1981.

□ 1340

The Soviet Union, Mr. Speaker, professes to be a just nation. Their actions, however, belie that claim. Yes; the Soviets did sign the Helsinki accords, but Soviet citizens and the Sakharovs are specific examples of those who are not allowed the basic human rights set forth in those accords. Their participation, in fact, in the Helsinki process has been and continues to be somewhat of a charade. Senate Concurrent Resolution 62 reaffirms the

concern in Congress about the fate of the Sakharovs. As an extension of that concern, we urge that the Sakharovs be allowed to exercise their rights of freedom of expression, travel, and communication. The November summit, Mr. Speaker, is fast approaching. Many previous speakers have referenced that in their remarks. Let me reiterate a statement that I made on this floor in the past: The Soviet Union could do much to improve the climate prior to the summit if they would live up to their commitment to human rights as a signer of the Helsinki accords. One significant demonstration, for the administration, for the Congress, and for the American people, of that commitment would be the release of Andrei Sakharov and Yelena Bonner.

Once again I commend my colleague, BARNEY FRANK, for his leadership in the continuing fight to gain the Sakharovs' release. I again commend Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and the chairman of the committee, Mr. YATRON, for their leadership, and also the chairman of the full Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, along with five of my colleagues, I went to the Soviet Embassy on behalf of Dr. Sakharov and Dr. Bonner. The account of that meeting has already been given. I would like to associate myself with the remarks that have already been given, particularly with the comments that, of course, Drs. Sakharov and Bonner are two individuals and there are so many thousands, even millions, in the Soviet Union who also suffer the violation of human rights. But Dr. Sakharov is more than just one individual. He has been a symbol of human rights in the Soviet Union and around the world. He has spoken out for human rights, and I think that is what makes it even more important that we in the U.S. Congress stand up today and express to the world and to the Soviet Union how important it is that the Soviet Union start complying with just a few of the many international agreements that they have signed that support the right of travel and emigration. This would be a wonderful chance for the Soviet Union with these two individuals to show that when they sign an agreement the agreement means something.

This is what is involved in the so-called linkage between human rights and other agreements such as agreements on arms reduction.

If we cannot trust the Soviet Union to honor agreements that they have signed and entered into in the field of human rights, we and other nations in the world must ask ourselves can we

trust the Soviet Union when it comes to other agreements that we hope will be in our mutual interest regarding arms reductions?

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution is taken seriously by the leaders of the Kremlin as we approach the summit negotiations and that they will heed our call and release Drs. Sakharov and Bonner.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING].

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege, an unfortunate honor, to participate in this debate. It is unfortunate because we should not have to be here pleading with a great nation, which the Soviet Union is, to exercise the kind of normal human concerns that we expect great nations to follow. We realize there are precedential problems here because Mr. Sakharov was a famous atomic scientist, but surely in the span of time which has passed since he participated in their atomic energy program, any really significant security aspects of this case have long since expired.

So, really, that cannot be a serious problem from the standpoint of the Soviet Union.

I remember when we had the case of the author of "Dr. Zhivago" and a great uproar was made during the era of Mr. Khrushchev's chairmanship in the Soviet Union, and finally Khrushchev asked one of his staff to look at the book and tell him what the uproar was all about. They came back and said, "Well, really, there is nothing in this book that ought to embarrass the Soviet Union." So Khrushchev said, "Well, then let's cool the whole thing."

The Sakharov case has been dragging on for a long time and reached proportions in international concern that perhaps elevate it beyond any other case of similar nature, but it does seem to me that what we are doing here, Mr. Speaker and distinguished gentlemen, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others who brought this to the floor, is simply asking the new head of the Soviet Government, the new chairman, Mr. Gorbachev, to please review this, as Mr. Khrushchev did in the case of the author of "Dr. Zhivago," and see if this really is worth all that they are going through. Would it not be better to show the new look in the Soviet Union, to show that there is indeed an effort to bridge some of the gaps that have hindered better relations in the past and make this a humanitarian gesture which would certainly bring upon the leadership the praise not only of this country but of men of goodwill all over the world.

I cannot think of a more important gesture for peace and goodwill prior to the summit meeting in November than the action which this resolution is recommending.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] for bringing it about, and I thank him for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YATRON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN. I thank my friend from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply involved in the cause of the seven, now six, hostages. But whether the jail is oppressively hot and dry or chilling and clammy, it makes little difference, the locks are just as fixed. I share Mr. SEIBERLING's statement that it is an honor to stand in support of this resolution but a rather tragic and mournful one.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if it is possible to get the word out to them, let them know that we have not forgotten, we will not forget until we get them home. That includes Andrei Sakharov and Yelena Bonner.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his supporting remarks and also his long, continued efforts on the issue of human rights, particularly his recent efforts in trying to free the seven hostages.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, the treatment of Soviet Jews by the Soviet state continues to deteriorate. This trend is at once dangerous and disturbing.

The rate of Jewish emigration from the U.S.S.R. has dropped from a high of 51,320 in 1979 to a nadir of 896 in 1984. At the same time the situation for the Jewish community remaining in the Soviet Union has deteriorated. We have witnessed increased harassment of Hebrew teachers and cultural activists which have resulted in a wave of searches, threats, and arrests. Changes in leadership have not resulted in a change of policy.

One blatant example of the continuing policy of harassment of Soviet Jews is the treatment being given Yelena Bonner and her husband, Andrei Sakharov. Ms. Bonner is in need of medical treatment which is being denied by Soviet authorities. Her son, Alexei Semyonov, is currently in the 19th day of a hunger strike in front of the Soviet Embassy here in Washington. Our appeal today for the release of Ms. Bonner and Dr. Sakharov is on humanitarian grounds.

I commend Chairman FASCELL for his leadership in bringing this bill before the House of Representatives. In the name of

justice and simple human dignity we must continue to remind the Soviet leadership that the plight of Soviet Jews shall not be forgotten.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my full support for this resolution (S. Con. Res. 62) expressing solidarity with the family of Dr. Andrei Sakharov.

While the plight of Dr. Sakharov and his wife Dr. Yelena Bonner has received considerable attention in this body during recent years, concern about their situation has been heightened of late as a result of a 14-day hunger strike on their behalf by Alexei Semyonov, Dr. Bonner's son and Dr. Sakharov's stepson. Mr. Semyonov decided on his hunger strike on August 18, his grandmother's birthday, when for the first time in his memory, there was no birthday card from Drs. Sakharov and Bonner. This single event capped a 6-month period of time when there has been no postal or telephonic communications with the Sakharovs.

Sentenced to internal exile in the closed Soviet city of Gorky for the past 5 years, the Sakharovs have become a symbol to the world of the courageous struggle for basic human rights that is being waged in the Soviet Union. The fact that they have not been heard from in such a long period of time is troubling to all of us, but especially to their own family.

Prior to his hunger strike, Mr. Semyonov made one final plea to the Soviet Embassy, threatening a fast if he was not allowed to see his parents. When his request was ignored, he came to Washington, sat on a street corner near the Soviet Embassy, and did not eat for 14 days. This was clearly a desperate act, but one that could easily be understood.

When the hunger strike was over, Mr. Semyonov had still not received any assurances by the Soviets that he would see his parents, but he had accomplished something of note. Mr. Semyonov ended his hunger strike only after the U.S. State Department pledged to make the plight of his parents a top priority issue. In a recent statement by Mr. Semyonov, he explained:

Today I am breaking my hunger strike which I started 14 days ago. Yesterday, I was contacted by the State Department. I was informed that they are making it a high priority issue for the U.S. Embassy in Moscow to find the whereabouts of my parents and to reestablish communication with them. I was assured that the State Department will use every opportunity to resolve the case of my parents before the November summit.

Today, through this resolution, we are pledging our support to the Sakharov family and recommitting ourselves to securing a full accounting of their whereabouts and welfare.

Most importantly, this resolution urges the President to protest, strongly and at the highest levels of the Soviet hierarchy, the continued human rights violations the Sakharovs have suffered at the hands of the Soviet Government. The timing of this message is obviously very significant. In November, President Reagan will be meeting with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in

Geneva for a 2-day summit. Clearly, it is absolutely essential that the human rights issue—and, particularly the Sakharov case—be a central focus of any talks with the Soviets prior to and during the summit.

Mr. Speaker, the strength and courage of Alexei Semyonov has been acknowledged and applauded by freedom lovers everywhere. Today, we must send our own message to the world that we, too, are morally outraged by the Soviet Union's treatment of Andrei Sakharov and Yelena Bonner, and that we will not rest until their situation is resolved. We must pass Senate Concurrent Resolution 62.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the Senate concurrent resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate concurrent resolution just concurred in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 392, APPROVING THE COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Speaker's table a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 392) to approve the Compact of Free Association and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. RUSSO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object in order to ask the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the following question: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the tax and trade language that is in this proposal before the House is identical language that was contained in House Joint Resolution 187 that passed the House of Representatives. Is that correct?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSO. Reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly correct.

Mr. RUSSO. And there is no further compact or treaty language dealing with the country of Palau?

Mr. UDALL. If the gentleman will yield further, that is right; the provisions relating to Palau have been removed from the bill.

Mr. RUSSO. With that assurance from the chairman, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the procedure being used here. At this point we have no copy of the legislation that we are considering, there is no report on the legislation that we are considering, there has been no layover time and no opportunity for Members to study the provisions of the bill.

I am not aware that we have a cost estimate of what this may cost the taxpayers when all is said and done. We are being asked to do it all by unanimous consent here this afternoon without any prior knowledge of the membership that the bill was even coming up.

I would hate to say that I find that the procedure is unusual, I find it disturbing, and I am at a loss to understand why we have to do this in such a hurry-up fashion when, in fact, the House is going to be meeting tomorrow. If, in fact, there are papers enough prepared to bring to the floor this afternoon, with a 24-hour layover period, we may be able to have a procedure that would allow at least an informed consent on behalf of the membership.

I would be very glad to yield, under my reservation, to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I can assure the gentleman, as one who was not in support of the original legislation, the work we have done on it in the House and now through the work with the Senate in the conference that this is why we believe a joint effort will be the best solution to a problem that must meet a deadline for the bases in the Marshall Islands, and the need and necessity to reach that agreement because it is about to expire, I believe the 1st of October.

That is No. 1. No. 2, the deadline is hurting us, but there is another reason; we have a lot of people who have worked on this who will not be able to be here next week, late in the week, and I think it is important, because of that deadline, that we are able to finalize this negotiated settlement between all Members involved.

May I remind the gentleman, the administration is not specifically happy with this solution now, and I do not

think they should be unhappy, but their original proposal, I think, was totally wrong. With the help of the chairman from Ohio and the chairman of the full committee and other Members, we have reached very, very good legislation which did pass this House, I believe, approximately 2 months ago and has been in the negotiating process. I am happy with what has come out of that.

□ 1355

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, I will yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. McCAIN] in a moment. Let me yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. UDALL. I agree with the gentleman, this is a lousy way to legislate anytime; but I think it is defensible in this situation, because we are dealing with a bill that has already passed the House.

We debated it at length; amendments were considered; months of hard work and trips to the Pacific Ocean to see these territories and listen to the inhabitants.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here today is really a tactical move. We have been negotiating with the Senators concerned with this, except for those on the Finance Committee; and earlier today we were able to get agreement on all of the provisions of the bill except the tax and trade provisions which are going to have to be resolved by the Finance Committee of the other body and the Committee on Ways and Means of this body.

So what we are doing is basically sending over a repeat of what we sent over earlier; but to give them some tactical options on the Senate side, trying to get agreement before the clock runs out on us.

There are some very important national security things, and that is why the Secretary of Defense and the White House gave such strong support. The Kwajalein Missile Range-Base, which is critically important to us in a lot of different ways is involved in this. The lease runs out on September 30 and it is going to take a legislative miracle and a lot of cooperation to get the job done; and that is what we are trying to do today; and not to confuse the Members to legislate in an unwise and hasty fashion.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the chairman.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. McCAIN].

Mr. McCAIN. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] who devotes so many hours here on the floor of the House to make sure that the proper legislative procedures are followed, and it is a job that requires a great deal of his time and commitment; and

I appreciate the gentleman bringing up his reservation at this time.

I would also like to point out, as the chairman did, this is not only not a new piece of legislation; we have been working on this legislation for some 15 years, No. 1. No. 2 is, five different committees in this House have had oversight, and have been able to address this issue and this piece of legislation to what many of us feel is to an exhaustive degree.

There are definite national security-national defense interests involved here, I believe of the highest order; not the least of which is our Kwajalein lease which is going to expire on the 1st of October.

I would like to again express my thanks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for bringing this up; I do feel as a member of two of the committees that oversight this, I would like to assure them that there has been a great deal of examination of this issue; it is the same piece of legislation that this body did debate at length and vote on, and I hope that he will withdraw his reservation, given those circumstances.

Finally I would like to thank both chairmen who are sitting over there; the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] for doing what many people deemed was impossible; with the help of a lot of other people, but without their leadership it would not have been possible.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, let me yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I want to assure the gentleman that as I understand the bill and the changes that have been made from what is before us today over what was here several months ago; if anything, this costs the taxpayers less, because the Senate took a pretty hard position on some of the things that we have done and some of those we have backed off in reaching this agreement.

I would echo what the gentleman from Arizona said; the Kwajalein Missile Base is of extreme national security importance to this country, and that arrangement runs out on September the 30th. It is absolutely vital that this legislation passed before that date. I do not know what could happen there; maybe we would be able to extend it, maybe not; I just do not know, but I think to play that kind of a game with our national security could be very damaging.

I would hope the gentleman would withdraw his reservation.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the various gentlemen for their observations.

Let me make my point again, however, Mr. Speaker. Unanimous consent implies informed consent. Now, it

seems to me that there are very few Members of this body who have any idea this piece of legislation is on the floor at the present time, nor do they have any idea that it was coming to the floor.

My question is: Why do we have to do it this afternoon? We are going to be in session here tomorrow. If in fact we can do this with a hurry-up procedure, why cannot we do it tomorrow when at least the Members will have had 24 hours in which to examine the issue, when we will have had a chance to get the administration's views on it. It seems to me that before the September 30 date we are still in timely fashion in order to get some of those kinds of things done.

I just do not understand this hurry-up procedure. I appreciate the assurances of everybody concerned, that in fact what we are doing is in the best interests of everyone, but I do not have very much in the way of documentation; all I have is the Members who are directly concerned with it, who have been in a series of negotiations, evidently over 15 years, finally coming to an agreement that they bring to the floor.

That gives me some cause for concern, I might tell the body, and, it just strikes me that maybe I as one Member who would like to give informed consent on this would like to have a little bit of additional time to look at it; say at least 24 hours.

I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. I would only say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that every single point the gentleman has raised is valid with the exception that as of 5 minutes ago we do have a copy of the bill on our side.

Mr. Speaker, every point the gentleman has raised is valid. The only question is whether we should go forth. Here, we have had a good bit of bipartisan, biinstitutional cooperation in the sense of discussions with the administration, although they do not have a formal position at this time, as well as discussions with the other body, in that what the unanimous consent request is attempting to do is move forward slightly further in the process of an ultimate bill, of which this probably will not be the exact ultimate statement because the other body will want to work its will as well.

I would only suggest to the gentleman that we have until the 30th of September if we are going to need an agreement that meets the October 1 deadline that the security people at the Defense Department tell us is mandatory. This represents a step forward; he is correct; we could deal with it tomorrow, but some of the people perhaps that are playing an active role might not be here tomorrow; I cannot speak for them.

The gentleman's points are correct, Mr. Speaker; the only question is whether the gentleman wants to continue and persist with his objection. I would urge that he not, but I would certainly respect him if he desires to do so.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has raised another point. If in fact the other body is going to have some concerns where they want to work their will on the piece of legislation, once again, in order to provide unanimous consent here, it seems to me at least we might want to know what some of the things are that are down in this bill that might raise some questions in the other body.

That raises one more point that at least gives me some pause.

I would be glad to yield to the chairman.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's concern. Let me say again, I wish we had 24 hours safely, or 48 hours; I would like to give the gentleman a lot of background and briefing on the subject, but this is not the last word, I would assure the gentleman.

The bill that is now before us is not acceptable in its present form to the Senate; there will be amendments and changes, and there is going to have to be some compromise between the Finance Committee and the Committee on Ways and Means. So it will be back.

What we are trying to do is save a day, when the clock is running down and you have got 10 days to go, every day counts. Friday is the last day of the week, and maybe the Senate can get a committee hearing, get time on the floor which is increasingly difficult over there.

We were afraid of delay, and really concerned about that, and had reason to believe that getting this today instead of tomorrow would make a big difference.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I say to the chairman, it does not seem to me that there would be any prevention in the Senate going ahead and holding hearings if in fact it is being held over in the House for unanimous consent. That would not prevent them from going ahead with hearings.

Let me yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], under my reservation.

Mr. SOLARZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding and I want to say to the gentleman that I think in the ordinary course of events, every one of the objections or considerations or concerns which he has expressed would be entirely valid, and I share all of them.

As the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] indicated, however, we are up against a deadline here in terms of the expiration of our lease on the Kwajalein Missile Range.

Now, the key point, I think, from the perspective of the interest the gentleman is trying to protect, is that even if we prove this clean bill today, it is still going to have to come back to the House in the form of a conference report. If this was our last opportunity to pass judgment on this legislation, I would object myself, on the grounds that the gentleman has, in the sense that our colleagues have not, had a chance to fully examine it.

Before this is ultimately enacted, there is going to have to be a conference agreement with the Senate; the bill in one form or another is going to come back; there will be ample opportunity at that stage for Members to fully inform themselves as to all the details of the bill, get the cost estimate, get the administration's point of view, find out the position of the Micronesians, et cetera, et cetera.

Whereas if we can approve this today, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior indicated, it may facilitate more expeditious consideration in the Senate.

The people who are carrying the burden of securing the approval of the other body for this legislation have told us that if we can take this step today, it may make it a little bit easier for them to move it expeditiously through the other body.

So I would hope that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], upon reflection, would be willing to withdraw his objection so we could move it forward with the understanding that it will be coming back to the House, and that before the House votes on this in the final form, we will make sure that every Member has available all of the appropriate materials and documentation so that informed judgments can be made.

□ 1405

But it would be a tragedy if, in spite of everybody's best efforts, we simply ran out of time, which we run the risk of doing because of the congressional schedule in the next couple of weeks where we are not going to be in session for several days, and the need for action by both Houses of Congress.

So this is really simply a measure to move a little bit forward and enhance the prospects for expeditious consideration in the Senate.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman.

Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING].

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman raises a very legitimate question here. I side with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I do not like this procedure one bit. The House passed the

original resolution before the recess, in July. Our staffs have been working with the staffs of the other body and the staffs from the administration throughout the recess and since then. We have been trying to sit down with Members of the other body and bridge the gap that the staffs were not able to bridge, and they are preoccupied over there with their business, which is very important, too, and it was not until today that we were able to sit down with the Senators who have the greatest concern for this legislation and discuss those differences and resolve them, which we did.

Now, the bill that passed the House has all kinds of provisions in it which were additions to and changes in the compact as negotiated by successive administrations over a 15-year period.

The subcommittee which I chair held 14 days of hearings spread out over a year to try to get a real handle on the impact of this very broad compact that was negotiated, impact on defense, on foreign affairs, on our economy, our trade, and so forth, and on the people of Micronesia.

We added a "Buy America" clause, we put in an ethics-in-Government clause, we put in various entitlements that take care of some of the needs that were not being met for the Micronesian people, and so forth, and we sent that to the Senate with the agreement of the House. The Senate, unfortunately, has not been able to focus on this until now.

But I assure the gentleman that none of the provisions here expanded any of the commitments that were made in the legislation that passed the Senate. They are contractions of those commitments. Therefore, it seems to me that this cannot be any more of a problem than the legislation that has already been approved by the House and, as has been already pointed out, it is going to come back from the Senate because they have certain other restrictions they wish to impose and the House will again have an opportunity to go for this.

Now, let me say just one other thing. I am sure the gentleman will be interested in this. I personally do not see any reason why it would be a great tragedy, from the standpoint of the people of Micronesia, if this did not pass, because the trusteeship will continue if that is the case. The trusteeship is far more expensive to the United States than this compact will be.

Second, we do have a risk, however, that the Kwajalein Missile Base lease will expire on September 30, which it will, unless we ratify this by that date, and then we will be at sea not only in terms of whether we can renegotiate it, but certainly we will pay a higher price because of the SDI Program, and so forth.

Now, I happen to oppose the SDI Program. So from that standpoint I might say, "Well, what the heck, let this lease expire, don't cooperate with the Senate and make it easier for them to get to this bill. Let it expire."

But as an institution, I think we have an obligation to the country. That is not the way to decide major issues. And that is why I am working very hard with the chairman and with the Senators and other Members who are interested on the minority side to see if we cannot give this an opportunity to get through the Senate in a timely fashion, because there are high national interests at stake.

That is why I plead with the gentleman to put this into perspective. Some of us are not going to be here, some of the people who have lived with this the most—and that includes myself—tomorrow and next week. Therefore, we feel that this is the best way to protect the House interests and to protect the interests of the country if we can handle it while those who are most familiar with it are here to deal with it. We think that this is in the national interest.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would simply say that I do appreciate the statements of all the Members involved. But unanimous consent does, in fact, mean that I or somebody on the floor, recognizing this procedure is happening, is supposed to give informed consent, I do not know what is in the package that we are being asked to approve by unanimous consent. I would hope that it would be brought back tomorrow, after I do have an understanding of what is in the bill.

For the moment, Mr. Speaker, I do object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, a Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 12, 1985.
Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Office of the Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule L(50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that Mr. Archie Lantz of my district office staff has been served with a witness subpoena issued by the State of Arkansas. After consultation with the General Counsel to the Clerk, I

will inform you of the determinations as required by the House Rule.

Sincerely,

JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT,
Member of Congress.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given the opportunity to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 392, the issue that was just objected to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

□ 1110

AMERICA'S NO. 1 EMPLOYER, THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY, NEEDS HELP

(Mr. NICHOLS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I spoke in this Chamber concerning the current trade deficit, and the lack of a fair and effective trade policy by the administration for the United States. Today, I would like to concentrate my remarks on an industry that is very important to my congressional district, my home State of Alabama, and the entire United States of America. I speak of the textile/apparel industry which is shouldering the brunt of the unregulated flood of imports coming into this country.

The textile/apparel industry has been the sleeping giant for employment for decades in America. Few people realize that this industry employs more Americans than any other manufacturing industry—more than steel, auto, or electronics. Yet, if measures are not taken, we will witness, before our very eyes, the elimination of this vitally important part of our industrial base. The symptoms are clearly prevalent, and if measures are not taken, and soon, the diagnosis will be terminal, and so will be the jobs of millions of Americans.

Who will be affected most if measures are not enacted to curtail the amount of imports flooding American markets? It will not be middle or upper class America. Instead, the Americans who can least afford it will be affected the most. Only last week I talked with a vice president at Dan River Mills in Alabama. He was making preparations for a mill to be permanently closed in only a few weeks. The employees are 85 percent black with a majority being women. When the plant closes the vice president will also lose his job, so the problem, Mr. Speaker, is affecting all class-

es, but with minorities obviously hardest hit.

Where can a 50-year-old black man who has been a loom fixer in a textile mill most of his entire adult life find a new job? Or what about a single-parent mother of four with only a high school education, and a home mortgage due at the end of each month? These are your typical textile workers, but where can they find new jobs? Relocate? Certainly, this is not a realistic option, because most workers own a home in the town where the mill was closed and it would be totally impractical to sell their home, pull up stakes, and locate elsewhere. The textile mill is usually the only employer in a small town, and when it closes down so does the entire community. As another alternative, should they get a job with one of the new high-tech industries of the future? With little formal education, textile workers are unlikely candidates for a position with a computer or electronics company. So where do they go?

Mr. Speaker, I contend the answer that is best for America and for the millions of citizens who depend on this industry for their livelihood, is for this Congress and the current administration to agree on legislation that is currently pending before Congress that will place limits on the amount of goods foreign nations can export to America. This legislation will also enforce trade agreements that constitute a fair international trade policy. I have grave concerns that if measures are not taken, and soon, we will witness Hong Kong, Korea, and China dominating the textile industry—an industry that America can little afford to lose.

And, Mr. Speaker, why should we not pass this critically needed legislation? Some opponents of the legislation say that quotas would increase prices for Americans. But, in reality, retailers already take cheap imports and oftentimes mark them up several hundred percent so that they are barely less expensive than domestic materials. Therefore, I suggest that no real increase in prices would be forthcoming, only a decrease in profit for retailers who are now benefiting from cheap imported products. Other critics contend passage of the textile bill would start a trade war. But again, Mr. Speaker, in reality this would not be the case because currently the United States has a tremendous trade deficit with the major textile producers in the world. There is no reason to believe whatsoever that these countries would cut off the few goods that are being imported into their countries.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope the President, in the coming days, will see the necessity for passage of the current textile bill before the House and Senate, and lend his support to this measure. Anything less will mean the

continued loss of jobs in America's No. 1 manufacturing industry, the textile/apparel industry, and the continued erosion of our Nation's industrial base.

CORNELIUS M. DALTON, DISTINGUISHED POLITICAL WRITER, COLUMNIST, EDITOR

(Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the death last week of Cornelius M. Dalton, the renowned former political columnist and editor of the old Boston Herald-Traveler. I had known Connie Dalton since my service in the Massachusetts Legislature and can personally attest to his fairness and perceptiveness as a reporter, columnist, and editor. He was a stickler for details and the truth in a broad spectrum of local, State, and national affairs, and he was the preeminent dean of Massachusetts political columnists. Connie Dalton's crowning work in his long and scholarly writing career was an excellent and illuminating history of the Massachusetts Legislature, which was published last summer.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my profound sympathy to Connie Dalton's beloved wife, Frances, and his three sons. I ask permission to have printed with my remarks an excellent column on Connie Dalton by David Farrell in the Boston Globe on Monday, September 16, 1985:

CONNIE DALTON: THE MR. CHIPS OF POLITICAL COLUMNISTS

(By David Farrell)

U.S. House Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill Jr. said it all when he described Cornelius M. Dalton, former political columnist and editor of the Boston Herald-Traveler, as "a grand gentleman . . . a great guy, honest and fair and decent in his reporting. I have never met a journalist who was more highly admired and respected."

The scholarly Dalton, who wrote about local and national politics for more than four decades, died last Thursday. His death caused little more than a ripple in the local media which is dominated by people who were in diapers when Dalton was in his prime.

But the qualities that made him special will never pass away. His integrity, professional standards, patriotism, warmth and sincerity were the hallmarks of his distinguished career.

Dalton was one of a kind. As a young political reporter in the early 1950s, I had the good fortune of breaking in under him at the State House.

He was a beautiful man, my Mr. Chips. He could get angry, but he never cursed and always maintained perfect decor. He quietly practiced his Catholic faith to which he was as true as he was to his wife, Fran.

When I think of men who have had a profound influence on my life, Connie ranks at the top with the Edward Hanifys, Eugene Moriarty and Jesuits at Boston College High School.

There was no guile in this honest man whose conscientiousness about his responsibilities bordered on the extreme. He was stickler for detail, for the precise word or phrase he felt would convey what he wanted to say. I can recall many times watching him staring at the copy in his typewriter in the State House pressroom and agonizing, sometimes for as much as an hour, over the wording of a particular paragraph.

Although he regularly labored long and hard for his scholarly columns about the issues of the day, he was not all work and no play. Occasionally after the day's work was done, he would hoist a couple of drinks at the old Bellevue Bar and engage some of his contemporaries in lively discussions about whatever else happened to be of interest at the time.

He could take a ribbing from his colleagues and often did. Mun Owens of the Globe, Jim King of the Associated Press and John (Chartreuse Gallagher) O'Connor of the Herald delighted in needling Dalton about his preoccupation with the "menace of communism" in America.

His lifelong concern with communism grew out of his wartime service with the Army Counterintelligence Corps and its focus on the subversive activities of local party functionaries.

After World War II he returned to the afternoon Traveler and wrote extensively about communists in America. He became friendly with FBI counter-spy Herbert Philbrick of Melrose, whose undercover role was revealed in a New York federal courtroom in 1949 and exposed the extent to which the Communist Party was infiltrating labor unions and other groups in the United States. Philbrick subsequently wrote a book, "I Led Three Lives," which was made into a popular television series in the 1950s.

Dalton concentrated on Massachusetts party officials such as Ann Burlak Timpson and Otis Archer Hood to such an extent that he once was accused by a communist labor organizer of being an undercover man for the House UnAmerican Activities Committee.

Throughout much of his career, Dalton lived in the shadow of the late Herald political editor William E. Mullins, whose "This Is How I See It" column dominated the New England political scene.

Under the direction of the late Herald-Traveler publisher Robert B. Choate, the widely read Mullins generally promoted the GOP cause in the Republican Herald. Dalton was too independent for anyone, Choate included, to dictate or even suggest what he should write.

Once when Dalton learned that an editor was preparing to sanitize and improve the taped responses of a prominent politician with whom he had conducted an interview, he became angry as I ever saw him, charged into Choate's office and aborted the scheme.

With the death of Mullins in 1958 and Dalton's transition to full-time columnist, Connie came into his own and enjoyed the status of being the dean of local political writers.

His excellent history of the Massachusetts Legislature, published this summer by Secretary of State Michael J. Connolly, is a tribute to Dalton's high standards. When I last talked to him several weeks ago, he had just been released from the hospital and was thrilled as a child with a new toy because his five-year effort was rolling off the presses.

THE RESCISSION REVISION

(Mr. DORNAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, to quote Mark Twain, "It could probably be shown by facts and figures that there is no distinctly native American criminal class except Congress."

After carefully reviewing the budget resolution recently passed by this Chamber, I have to conclude that Mark Twain is probably right. The document is a fraud and by my best reckoning overstates fiscal year 1986 savings by \$27 billion. With accounting like that, it is no wonder people are crying out for budget reform.

Part of the problem with the budget process is a lack of accountability. In order that we might bring some small measure of accountability back to the process, I have recently introduced legislation that would amend the Budget Act of 1974 to provide that any rescission of budget authority proposed by the President, which are funds for which the President does not anticipate any current or prospective need, will take effect after 45 days unless disapproved by Congress.

As you are aware, under current law when the President requests a rescission, the funds must be spent unless the Congress approves the rescission within 45 days. Therefore, if the Congress does nothing, the money gets spent. This lets individual Members of Congress off the hook because they do not have to go on record as supporting or opposing specific budget cutting proposals presented as rescissions by the President. For instance, in fiscal year 1983, President Reagan proposed rescissions totaling some \$1.6 billion. The congressional reaction was to do nothing, and the money was spent. No vote, no record, no accountability. It was all nice and clean, and inherently destructive to budgetary responsibility.

There is no legitimate reason why the Congress should not be required to vote up or down on specific rescission proposals. My proposal would not shift the balance of power between the President and Congress in any significant way, but would bring some congressional accountability back to the rescission process.

We were all elected, everyone of us, because our constituents thought we were gritty enough to stand tall in representing them and make the tough decisions. It is about time that we started making those tough calls, and amending our rescission process is a good place to start.

I therefore urge my colleagues to co-sponsor this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in my remaining time, I want to comment on the ABC program, "45-85" followup discussion last

night on television, hosted by liberal stars Peter Jennings and Ted Koppel.

Last night's 3 hours of "45-85" was basically balanced although most important accomplishments of our country over the last 40 years were left out. But the hour-and-a-half discussion that followed the last evening news was nothing short of nauseous.

Why do we put on our free networks a paid, Soviet, hard-line Communist propagandist, the likes of Georgi Arbatov? Even Jeane Kirkpatrick was so disgusted with his outrageous lies that she came off as a disinterested party, while liberal journalists were generally obsequious. It was a disgusting performance by a weakly challenged Arbatov.

VOYAGE THROUGH THE GRAND CANYON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. McCAIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, during the August recess, I had the pleasure of accompanying a National Park Service River Patrol through the Grand Canyon on the Colorado River. I departed from the halfway point, Phantom Ranch, on August 12. I believe it is significant to note that this was exactly 45 years after Arizona's distinguished senior Senator, BARRY GOLDWATER, left Phantom Ranch on his maiden voyage through the Canyon.

Forty-five years ago, BARRY GOLDWATER was the 73d person to run the Grand Canyon, a tradition that began with noted adventurer and explorer, John Wesley Powell, in 1869. Between the Senator's voyage and my own, more than 100,000 people from all over the world have experienced the thrill of rafting the Canyon. A trip, through the Canyon is a far different journey today than it was 45 years ago. Yet, as Senator GOLDWATER has stated, "Any voyage on the Colorado River through its canyons is an experience known only to those whose travels take them to places where footprints are seldom seen." And I believe John Wesley Powell's words are as appropriate today as they were 116 years ago. "All about me are interesting geological words. The book is open, and I can read as I run. All about me are grand views, for the clouds are playing again in the gorges."

During my raft trip, I had the good fortune to spend time with members of the National Park Service River Patrol. I watched them perform their duties firsthand, in the form of a serious medical evacuation as well as enforcing river safety and sanitation. I am proud that our country has such dedicated public servants such as Kim Crumbo, Kim Johnson, Mark O'Neil, and Ruth Ann Murray, who are capa-

ble and willing to aid visitors on their journeys through the Canyon. These people are truly dedicated and committed to preserving our precious environment.

Although my trip was truly a remarkable experience, it did expose a problem: The issue of aircraft noise. This is largely the result of aircraft sightseeing within the canyon. While I do not deny the joy many must feel in viewing the spectacular sights that abound in the canyon, I do not believe this should be done at the complete expense of those trying to experience the canyon accompanied by the sounds of rushing water, the cry of the blue heron, and the other unique sounds endemic to the area.

I am aware that the Superintendent of the Grand Canyon National Park Dick Marks who is performing an outstanding service plans to hold a series of public meetings this fall to examine the noise pollution question. I commend him for this effort. I believe the Congress should be prepared to act in whatever fashion appropriate to aid in a resolution of the noise issue. I also believe a solution must take into account any impact it could have on the economy of the surrounding communities while respecting the rights of those seeking the river's solitude.

Of the countless natural treasures our Nation possesses, the Grand Canyon is truly one of the most magnificent. Over the years millions of visitors have had the opportunity to enjoy the canyon as well as our other natural wonders. I believe it is our duty as responsible Members of Congress to ensure that our children and our children's children yet to come can experience these treasures and have such an opportunity.

A MOLE AMONG THE GERBILS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. McKINNEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 2 of this year I introduced H.R. 1924, a bill to prohibit the use of polygraph tests in private industry in connection with applications for employment or as a condition of continued employment. In July the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities held hearings on the issue of polygraph testing in the workplace, and yesterday the subcommittee favorably reported polygraph legislation. It has taken many years for such legislation to move this far, and I hope this measure quickly moves through full committee and onto the House floor for discussion and vote.

My colleagues, the issue of lie detector tests in private industry can no longer be ignored, and their rampant use no longer tolerated. I urge you to help put an end to the countless humiliating and frustrating experiences to which the American people

are subjected because of the polygraph. There are hundreds of cases that I could relate to you describing the unreliability of lie detector tests and their accusatory and demeaning nature, but I will limit myself to two such examples.

In the March 11, 1985, edition of *Newsweek* magazine, Mr. Irving Kaler, an attorney in Atlanta, GA, wrote an article about his young son's ordeal with the polygraph. Mr. Kaler's son, Michael, applied for a job at a local discount store in the pet department. Michael was to assume the duties of handling animals such as rabbits, goldfish, and puppies and stocking supplies. He would handle absolutely no cash since all purchases are made at the registers at the front of the store. Michael was required to take a polygraph test as a condition of employment. He flunked the test and was denied employment. Mind you, Michael is only 16 years old—16 years old and thanks to some mechanical contraption is now branded as deceitful, an infamous scoundrel, a would-be birdseed burglar. Talk about child abuse, let alone violating one's civil rights guaranteed by our Constitution. This story horrified me, and I wonder how you would feel if your teenager was unable to find employment because he or she could not pass a polygraph test.

The second incident involves a woman working in a California grocery store who was required to take a polygraph test after money was found missing from a store register. It was not her register but she was required to take the test out of fairness to all employees. Unfortunately, this woman failed the test and was promptly fired from her position. One of the employees told her that not only did he take the money but he also passed the test. This is a common example of countless situations when people lie and pass the polygraph test, while others tell the truth and are wrongly punished.

The Congressional Office of Technology Assessment in a recent study of the validity of polygraph testing concluded that the percentage of innocent people found deceptive is as high as 50 percent. Too often, innocent people are labeled liars or social misfits. Consequently, potential or current employees, people both valuable and productive, are needlessly denied employment. In addition, employees who fail the lie detector test often find that their alleged deceptive or dishonest tendencies become part of their personnel record, hindering future employment. As brought out during the polygraph hearings, over 2 million people are given these inaccurate, unreliable, intrusive tests annually. Why are we allowing our constituents to be subjected to this horror?

Fellow colleagues, I urge you to give this issue your utmost attention so that we can make the use of this barbaric workplace practice a part of history.

I call your attention to the following *Newsweek* article, which I earlier mentioned.

A MOLE AMONG THE GERBILS?

(By Irving K. Kaler)

It wasn't until my son Michael applied for a job as a stockboy in the pet department of a local discount store that I learned that I was the father of a potentially hardened criminal.

As a condition of his employment, Michael was subjected to a lie-detector test. After all, the pet department must be protected from unwittingly giving employment to a possible guppy snatcher or a goldfish filcher. But Michael, who is only 16 and who has never had any altercation with the law, became understandably agitated when asked questions such as how many times he had been married (none), and how many times he had been arrested (again, none).

Apparently, the machine and the operator made no distinction between one type of agitation and another, so Michael, whose nature is open and guileless, was declared to have flunked that test. Michael's only transgressions are an excessive volubility in class and perhaps an affinity to a father whose humor inclines more toward Milton Berle than to Russell Baker.

Now, thanks to this incident, I almost feel as if I have joined the company of Ma Barker in the pantheon of wicked parents. I avert my eyes when passing our neighborhood post office, apprehensive that there is displayed an unflattering picture of my son.

This episode jarred me into investigating the current use of the lie-detector device, also known as the polygraph. Why, for instance, are we Americans increasingly willing to consign to some person or machine our right to think and make determinations for ourselves? It is bad enough that we entrust this authority to politicians, but it is absolutely incomprehensible that we rely upon some goofy, Rube Goldberg-type contraption to make sensitive decisions.

FEELING

It so happens that Michael has an unusual aptitude for caring for small animals. As a matter of fact, he has a regular job with a neighbor feeding and watering chickens, rabbits and even ponies. The machine that disqualified him is not capable of discerning this special feeling and regard.

This box which measures pulse rate, blood pressure, respiration and perspiration, is being used, I learned by a great many businessmen and retailers to screen employees; at least a million tests are performed each year. In the store where Michael works carrying customers' bags to their cars, only a few departments administer a polygraph test. Under this idiosyncratic policy, he has been disqualified from stocking birdseed, but not from becoming a manager.

I am not alone in registering any apprehension about this matter. There is increasing opposition to the expanded use of the polygraph, based on concerns that the machine represents an invasion of privacy and that its findings are often unfounded and imprecise. Twenty-two states and the District of Columbia prohibit employers from requiring an employee to take a lie-detector examination. Congress is considering a bill that would restrict its use by federal agencies, except the CIA and National Security Agency, and require the consent of the person being examined. A federal judge in Macon, Ga., Judge Wilbur D. Owens Jr., has also noted that "because of the lack of scientific evidence in support of polygraph validity, polygraph results are inadmissible as evidence in criminal prosecutions, both in

the United States courts, and in Georgia courts."

In his potentially landmark decision, Judge Owens recently ruled that it is unconstitutional for certain Georgia municipalities to compel their employees to take lie-detector examinations even during departmental investigations into suspected drug use. "No device known to man can 'read' an individual's mind and indicate whether that person is lying," he said. The test, he found, is "nothing more than the polygraph examiner's personal opinion of the truthful or deceptive manner in which the questioned person responded." The examiner formulates the questions; the employee is not allowed to present any evidence or otherwise dispute a suggestion of wrongdoing. "The polygraph examiner in reality becomes both judge and jury."

Moreover, the polygraph report may become a permanent part of an employee's records, and he can never compel a correction. Thus, like the mark of Cain, detrimental results can pursue him forever and mar his chances for any job. As Judge Owens points out, this may violate his rights under Fourteenth Amendment.

GUARDS

I recently went to the pet department of the store I mentioned earlier and was appalled by the indifferent care accorded the rabbits, guppies, hamsters, goldfish, canaries, gerbils, parakeets and puppies being sold there. I also noticed that no money is exchanged in that department since all purchases are concluded at a battery of cash registers at the front of the store. Only pets, or their supplies, can be pilfered. And I can't imagine any commodity less capable of being smuggled through the maze of detectors, sonic beams, sound alarms, turnstiles, guards, clerks and cashiers than a squirming rabbit, or more difficult to camouflage than a bulbous goldfish bowl.

Men and women of America, it is time we rise in indignation against this untrammeled invasion of our humanity! After all, we should possess a greater power to reason than some cold and merciless machine which, in all likelihood, hates rabbits, puppies and even those limpid-eyed guppies.

SUPERFUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ECKART] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ECKART of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to direct the attention of the House to an issue of grave importance to us all, the imminent expiration of the Superfund Hazardous Waste Cleanup Program and the urgent need to reauthorize it.

Failure to pass a 5-year reauthorization of this important environmental protection program will unnecessarily expose thousands of our constituents across the United States to the unnecessary risks of continuing to live with these awful cancerous substances in their backyards.

As this first chart so graphically illustrates, Mr. Lee Thomas, EPA Administrator, recently advised the Congress of his intentions, through the balance of this fiscal year and through the next, to spend between \$900 mil-

lion and \$1.05 billion under their current spending program.

□ 1420

That kind of money could mean a lot of relief to our constituents who find these hazardous waste dumps littering their backyards. But because we have failed to yet authorize Superfund for another 5 years, as this chart so clearly indicates, under the contingency plan developed by Mr. THOMAS, that spending would go from almost \$900 million in fiscal year 1986 to the dangerously low level of \$145 million. This means that from those very high projected expenditures, EPA will slash and cut, stop and discontinue meaningful enforcement and cleanup programs all across the United States because of congressional inaction.

Whether we agree or disagree with any of the several proposed bills, including the one that Congressman NORM LENT and I guided through the House Energy and Commerce Committee, and which was approved by a margin of 31 to 10, the course and the cause of this session of Congress ought to be clear: Failing to reauthorize Superfund subjects our constituents to only the most egregious hazardous waste dangers.

Cleanup has already been delayed or slowed at 67 sites across the United States, including 4 in my own home State and 2 in my own district. Thirteen in New Jersey, five in Massachusetts, four in California, three in Washington, and the list goes on.

But even if we were to pass an extension in Superfund taxing authority to give us more time to act, the infusion of money into the EPA would be nowhere near enough to keep the program moving. As this second chart shows, there would be a shortfall of almost \$685 million between that which the Agency has simply requested and that which a 3-month extension would provide.

My friends, there are \$685 million unspent toward the cleanup of this Nation's hazardous waste, money that is long overdue and which needs to be spent. But by far, the worst effect of our failure to reauthorize Superfund is seen so dramatically and clearly when we compare the remaining cleanup funds with the proposed cleanup funding levels in my bill, H.R. 2817, the Superfund reauthorization legislation passed by the Energy and Commerce Committee.

As this chart so graphically demonstrates, under H.R. 2817, compared with the administration's request, and compared with the contingency plan and meaningless 90-day extension advocated by some of our adversaries, you can quickly see that the difference is \$1,785,000,000 less: \$1.7 billion less of cleanups; \$1.7 billion less of removing cancerous, hazardous waste dumps from our constituents' backyards.

An astonishing figure, Mr. Speaker, and a number that could mean so much more to clean water, clean air, and a prevention of environmental disasters all across this Nation's landscape. My friends, a clean, safe, and healthy environment truly has no price. It is invaluable. But saving our health and environment truly does. Its price is hard work, determination, and dedication on the part of the Members of the House and indeed, even of the other body, which this very day, some of which I agree and some of which I disagree, is nonetheless moving inexorably toward meeting that critical September 30 deadline.

Let us not play politics; environmental, industrial, or partisan politics with the health and welfare of millions of constituents all across this Nation. Reauthorization for 5 years of Superfund, and particularly H.R. 2817 which provides \$10 billion for cleaning up the Nation's worst hazardous waste sites is a political, economic, and environmental imperative.

THE FARM CREDIT CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, on September 3, I held a hearing on the farm credit crisis with Congressman TOM DASCHLE in Worthington, MN. This hearing was an excellent opportunity to receive testimony on the farm credit situation from a broad spectrum of rural America. We heard from bankers, farmers, farmers' wives, a representative of the Farm Credit System, and representatives of farm groups. Their testimony demonstrated just how serious the situation is in rural America, and how desperately congressional action is needed to avoid a complete disaster.

Because Congress will be taking up the farm bill tomorrow, and will in all likelihood vote on the farm bill next week, and because in all likelihood credit legislation may be acted upon this year, I think our findings at this hearing are especially timely and important. Time and time again I heard from my constituents, "Do people understand in Washington? Are they hearing our message?" This is a great frustration in rural America today. Congressman DASCHLE and I pledged that we would report back to Washington the feelings of those people that met with us in Worthington as well as in South Dakota earlier in the day. I want to report to my colleagues in Congress on these hearings, and recap the views that were presented. The testimony we heard included an overall presentation of the credit crisis in rural America, accounts of how this crisis is affecting individuals, descriptions of the situation rural bankers

face, and a report on the problems of the Farm Credit System.

The reports that I am going to make to the Members now in the course of this special order consist mainly of direct quotations from individuals, not Members of Congress, but individuals who are on the front line, either as borrowers or lenders in the Farm Credit System.

Leslie Peterson, the president of the Farmers State Bank of Trimont, gave us an overview of the credit situation in rural America. He said that the situation is "critical and continues to deteriorate, more rapidly now, particularly in the midsection of the country." He quoted studies that estimate half of the farm debt in America is under stress and one-third in serious trouble. Then he outlined how the credit crisis is having an impact on all lenders and more specifically on rural banks:

The farm credit crisis is rapidly being transferred to the lending industry along with the responsibility for determining who remains farming. Lenders are finding the task of determining who remains farming extremely difficult because there is no price support structure in place to base projections on.

The losses realized after liquidation of these farm operations will be assumed by the lenders. These losses are in turn passed on to the good borrowers in the form of higher interest rates and fees. These imposed responsibilities on lenders are a primary reason many are withdrawing from the farm credit field and even rural communities.

The credit crisis with loan defaults and the resulting losses adversely impact all lenders and more specifically country banks in many ways:

There is a public loss of confidence in the private financial institutions. Deposits will move elsewhere or above market rates will have to be paid to retain them. The farm credit system is already experiencing this increased cost of funds in the market which is passed on to borrowers.

Above market loan rates must be charged to off set losses and loans on nonaccrual. This drives the good customer to competing sources of credit and financial services.

Legal defense costs and bankruptcies become a significant part of the cost of lending.

Personnel costs to properly supervise marginal credits and monitor the lenders security position escalate. (Example—compliance with the farm product exception to the Uniform Commercial Code changes.)

Insurance companies are withdrawing from the country bank market for Directors and Officers Liability and Bankers Blanket Bond insurance. The increased cost of the coverages impact the profitability of country banks and can force a bank to close if coverage cannot be obtained.

Inability to obtain Directors and Officers Liability coverage makes it difficult to impossible to retain good directors in a country bank.

The stress imposed upon lending officers makes it difficult to retain good people in these positions.

Losses impair the capital of banks, reduce dividends, and cause a loss of confidence in

country banks and their ability to serve their communities.

This farm financial crisis is building on itself. As net farm income declines, the ability of farmers to service debt is reduced, leading to more liquidation of land and other assets and lower land values. We don't see an end to this cycle. These conditions increase the number of insolvent farmers and the magnitude of loan losses to lenders.

This cycle of deterioration has to be stopped before farm asset values are totally destroyed and with it, the total infrastructure supporting agriculture, including the farm lenders.

□ 1430

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBER. I have a limited time and a lot of testimony, but I would be more than pleased to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota, who has been such a leader on these issues.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested in hearing the gentleman's discussion, and I agree that what we are hearing in our districts, me in North Dakota and the gentleman in a rural district in Minnesota, spells serious trouble not just in the next months but in the next 6 years unless we resolve this issue one way or another.

I am struck by the information the gentleman has provided us with respect to credit needs and credit institution difficulties. My observation is that all of this ultimately has to be solved with the price, one way or another, whether the price comes from a Government program or from the marketplace, and that ultimately, unless we stop the bleeding at the bottom, anything we do at the top really is irrelevant because the thing will continue to hemorrhage and things will continue to deteriorate in rural America.

It is not a Democrat or Republican problem, but my concern is that in order to solve it, at least it seems to me in the short term with respect to price, we are going to have to pass a farm bill that shores up some of the prices through price supports, and the threat of a Presidential veto of the bill that we are bringing to the floor in a few days is a very ominous threat, at least to me in North Dakota and to farmers in the gentleman's district.

I am hoping that we can work together on both sides of the aisle to convince the administration that we have to, in order to solve this problem in the short term, move price supports to an area that will give family farmers a chance to make a decent living. It is that simple. In the long term, we can adjust all sorts of mechanisms that respond more to what we hope would be improved market conditions worldwide, but in the short term farmers have to survive.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize the bipartisanship with which we have to approach this problem is one of my objectives. That is why, and I do not know if the gentleman heard the first part of my remarks, but this is a hearing I held with Congressman DASCHLE, and that is one of the points we make. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution here, too.

I do want to say, even though, as the gentleman knows, I am a supporter of this administration in most areas, I agree with him that they are dead wrong in farm policy. The old adage about being penny wise and pound foolish really applies to their approach to this farm bill. They are going to find that if they do not accept a farm bill that will deal with the underlying problems that the gentleman has outlined, it is going to cost them far more in the next few years than they would otherwise incur if they would be willing to spend the money that is necessary to get agriculture out of its depression now.

I agree with the gentleman that we have to change that bill when it comes to the floor, and we have got to be ready to deal with a Presidential veto if it comes.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. If the gentleman will yield further, let me say that what the gentleman is saying about the conditions that exist is accurate, and I know that he is working to try to solve these problems.

Again, it is not my intention to be partisan at all, but it is to say that the President sent us a plan, as the gentleman knows, that was just unacceptable to both sides of the aisle.

Mr. WEBER. I agree.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. It says let us just do nothing for agriculture; got to the open market. That is just unacceptable. So that lack of leadership has really caused us a great deal of turmoil inside. There are areas where the President is right, where he is leading in the right direction; there are areas where he is wrong. That is the case with all of us in public life.

In this instance, it hits home pretty hard because in agriculture we desperately need some leadership. Let me say to the gentleman that his willingness to step out and address these problems on his side of the aisle is appreciated by me and others.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to add one additional point. The other component of this problem, and I mention it because the gentleman from North Dakota has also been outspoken in this area, is Federal Reserve monetary policy, not to detract at all from the shortcomings from the administration's farm policy, but that is the other part of the problem that I have talked about and the gentleman from

North Dakota has talked about as well. That is the other thing that needs to be addressed.

I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Returning to my report to the Congress on the hearings that we held in Worthington, MN, the analysis that I just went through shows how serious the overall financial situation in rural America is. As Representatives, we also should know how the credit crisis affects individuals as people. Congressman DASCHLE and I heard accounts from several people about their own farming operations, and I would like to recount some of them because this is, after all, a personal and individual and human problem as well as an economic and to some extent political problem.

Linda Ehrens grew up on a farm, farms with her husband now in Renville County, MN, and is a former employee of a local production Credit association. She told us about the growing tension in rural areas.

I see friends and neighbors being left without funds for food, clothing, and the staples of life without a fair hearing. I see others being "talked" into selling out without available loan servicing options being presented to them. I see Federal Land Bank and Production Credit Associations having no forbearance in working with member-borrowers in financial stress. I see Boards of Directors and staff being forced to approve and implement policies and mergers to "save the system" no matter what the consequence. What I don't see from Farm Credit is a program to save agriculture, a program to save family farms, a program to get a fair price for the producer, a program to promote free-enterprise within agriculture.

Jay York is a farmer in Murray County and a director of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. In his testimony, he mentioned how interest rates have climbed. This past year, while general interest rates were falling for most of the economy, the St. Paul district of FCS, which includes the area I represent, raised their interest rates by one-half of 1 percent to cover heavy losses elsewhere in the system. His testimony tells of the squeeze farmers are caught in today.

I am Jay A. York, of Lake Wilson, Minn. Murray County, and raise corn, soybeans and some small grain on 520 acres of owned land and some additional rented acres. My two sons also farm on their own, but we do have some jointly owned machinery and work together as a family operation to make maximum use of our labor and equipment.

I have a federal land bank loan and my son, Lee, is a third generation borrower, having purchased 160 acres a few years ago. We are current with our loans, but can see problems, and are having them with the interest rates charged on these loans. Loans that were 7 or 8 percent when made are at 12½ percent now, and as a letter from them states, there may be higher rates ahead to cover losses or slow payment problems. It seems their remedy for the inability to pay

is to charge more. We realize the problem they face, and the answer may be to make agriculture more profitable. However Secretary Block seems to be saying our prices are too high, and that to survive we need lower support prices. At a time when our costs are going higher, this does not seem to be the answer, at least in the short term. The problem is here now! we cannot pay our ever increasing bills with lower priced commodities.

Let's not destroy production agriculture by "kicking the can along" and not seriously addressing its problems.

I am encouraged today by this joint meeting and participation of these two Congressmen representing our two main parties. In times of crisis we need the best from everyone. As a rural electric director and a director of the National Rural Electric Association representing this State, I want to commend both these gentlemen for their support of REA. I urge you to make every effort to find a solution to these many problems. The need is urgent in rural America.

Allan Wiese, who lives in Blue Earth County, told us how his two brothers were forced to sell out. Let me read you the description of that sale and his concluding remarks:

Finally, the day of the sale arrived. It was like going to a funeral of your best friend. The three-hour sale wiped out what it took our family 30 years to accumulate and develop in livestock and machinery. It was one of the most devastating moments of our lives. I watched tractors, combines, a swather, etc., we had used from dawn to dusk, day in and day out, liquidated in minutes and seconds. I watched two young farmers and one weary father fight back tears and anger time and again as their lives built on sweat, hopes, and dreams were snuffed by what they understood as the auctioneer's cry and buyer's highest bid. In retrospect we know it was not necessarily poor management, but instead forces beyond their control that dashed their dreams and crippled their confidence.

Just because farm sales are held and businesses go broke does not mean the problems are resolved. Subsequent to my brothers' sale, my youngest brother and sister-in-law have worked even more hours than before their farm crisis at a steak house. This means more time away from their two young sons and less family time together. My brother, who partially sold out, has taken on more acreage to try to offset the decline in commodity prices and continued high interest rates. This prevents him from having more time with his wife and three children. Despite his 11 years of hard work, attempting to save his land and livelihood, he seems to be waging a losing battle. Because of their financial status, these two families now qualify to receive free government commodities, e.g., cheese. Each brother has also reduced their social and community activities to save money. Finally, an outgrowth of the decimation of farmers and rural communities is the crumbling of the values of these good citizens. Just two weeks ago when I inquired of my sister-in-law how things were going in her neighborhood, she stated people were more out for themselves and less trusting of their neighbors as to whether repayment for things borrowed would occur. Though not members of my own family, I know farmers who have quit attending church and community functions because of pride and personal conflicts as a

result of the economic conditions in rural America today.

In summary, rural Americans, be they a farmer, housewife, teacher, laborer, student, or small town businessperson, are more than bits of data. They are first class citizens that possess and nurture the spirit of America that began with our Founding Fathers and has continued to serve as the foundation of this nation. That spirit embodies individualism, creativity, neighborliness, a strong work ethic, and patriotism. Every time a farmer or business goes broke in rural America the spirit of America is diminished. Does it make sense to cut away the business, social, and religious fabric that undergirds the soul of this nation for the sake of cheap foreign labor and cheap food. I submit to you history will judge harshly those that measure the greatness of a nation based on financial statements and balance sheets while ignoring the irreparable harm being done to the social structure and family institution in rural America.

□ 1440

Delores Swoboda is on the State steering committee of Groundswell, a farm organization that has sprung up in Minnesota in response to the farm crisis that we find gripping our part of the country today. She told us how fast the crisis is spreading from individuals to entire communities:

I am shocked at how fast the crisis is becoming worse and worse. Dozens of farmers in every county in Minnesota have already deeded back their land to their lender, dozens more are facing foreclosure in the next few months, and dozens more are already in foreclosure. As each farmer loses out, so also do the businesses in rural America, and as the businesses fail laborers are without work, and all of this is affecting the welfare of our banks. It is a chain effect that will result in the total destruction of rural America, and a way of life that may never be able to be replaced.

RURAL BANKS

The farm crisis does indeed affect everyone in rural America. Gary Sonstegard from the Watson State Bank in Watson, MN, told how rural banks are trying to deal with fluctuating interest rates and a weak farm economy. I quote from his testimony, as follows:

Another area of concern is interest rates. I know in our area the interest rates have not dropped as dramatically as the prime rate for farm borrowers. The major reason for this is the risk involved in each bank's portfolio and unless we keep our spread between the rates we are paying and the rates we are receiving, we will also be in trouble as a lending institution. We have to continue to generate profits in order to cover and make allowance for potential loan losses in our portfolio.

The other part of this problem is profitability on the farm level. At current prices it is almost impossible for any farmers to cash flow his operation. In 1984 in going through our own credit files, we can see from the farmers tax returns that were submitted to us, 90 percent of them lost money. We need a price so that farmers can make a profit and remain in business. If not, I can see, as stated before, farmers, businesses, and financial institutions dependent upon agriculture will fall like dominoes. This in turn will cause many rural communities to become

ghost towns. I don't think the Government or anyone else wants to see this. Agriculture has been and is the back-bone of our country. It is still directly related to 40 percent of our economy yet only 3 percent of our Federal Budget is spent on farm programs. In reality, we are not subsidizing the farmer, we are subsidizing the consumer. We have the cheapest food in the world. I have seen several studies that peg 15 percent of our disposable income is spent for food while 25-35 percent of disposable income is spent in almost all other countries. If we want to continue to have cheap food, then we cannot penalize the farmer, who is the most efficient operator in the world. If the farmer can make a profit, he will pay taxes, buy goods and services, create employment and in turn our whole economy will be better off. I would venture to say that whatever the Government spends on farm programs, a good portion of this would come back in taxes, reduced unemployment benefits, increased sales taxes to states and probably the most important, the continuation of a rural society that will continue to grow and prosper and be the back-bone of our country. What would be the cost of re-training and relocating this society? If the present trend continues the economic and social structure we now have with the family farms and small businesses and rural communities will be a thing of the past.

Our farm customers, for the most part, are usually very optimistic people. This is not the case now. They are, to put it frankly, depressed just like the economy. They feel there is little hope. They feel the administration has abandoned them. They cannot give their children any hope of a future in farming as they see little hope for themselves. The majority of these are good farmers who enjoy their work and take pride in it. The pressure put on them by the situation is almost too much to bear. A sign of the times, was last winter when about half of all farm meetings had to do with stress and how to handle it. I dread the thought of what this winter will be like if nothing is done to bolster the farm economy.

Finally, we also heard testimony from John Ryan, who is the director of the Farm Credit Board of St. Paul, which represents the seventh district of the Farm Credit System. He outlined how serious the situation was for the entire Farm Credit System. I quote now from John Ryan's testimony, as follows:

I'd like to give you a few specifics of what is happening in our district this year. The seventh district is anticipating at least \$170 million in loan losses this year—\$100 million for Federal Land Bank and \$70 million for PCA. These reflect farmer's losses; farmers involved with that credit and are also experiencing losses. Farmers are increasingly unable to service debt on many of their loans. Nonperforming assets are expected to total about \$605 million—\$400 million for FLB; \$200 million for PCA, and \$5 million for Bank of Cooperatives. That affects our earnings: Our earnings in 1984 for the Seventh District amounted to \$122 million. Right now, even though we have increased our Land Bank interest rate during the past few months, we are projecting a \$7 million dollar loss in 1985 compared to \$122 million we earned in 1984. Our objective is to lower this rate as soon as possible. However, with

these projected losses, without outside help, this won't be possible.

If we look at our Production Credit Associations across the southern tier of Minnesota counties, of which most are on Congressman Weber's district, we would find that barely 50 percent of our loans at the current time are classified acceptable. This means that nearly half of our loans are in the problem and vulnerable class and almost 20 percent of the loans we have are considered loss loans at this time. Our 1985 PCA foreclosures in the state of Minnesota are currently at 57 compared to 15 we had in 1984. We have also had 86 farmers declare bankruptcy compared to 32 last year. This does not take into consideration the acquired property which we have, which was deeded directly to the Land Banks and the PCAs throughout the state.

We have made a commitment in the Seventh District to continue to serve the farmers as best we can by keeping all of our associations offices open, by protecting the B-stock to the highest degree possible by use of capital management, merger and so forth. We feel that we are in this together and will work together to solve the problem together.

These efforts alone are not enough to swing the pendulum back to a more profitable, less stressful agriculture. It will take more than just state or local answers and solutions. As I mentioned earlier, it will require national answers, cooperation and a commitment from you, myself, your congressional peers and our borrowers. We have made that commitment and support your continued efforts to help solve our problems.

We must act together to ensure agriculture remains a viable industry here in southern Minnesota and throughout all other farming communities across rural America. Reasonable profits, stable asset values and manageable interest rates is what the American farmer needs. It's what he deserves and with your help, it's what he will get.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we got testimony from a wide range of people. There were some points of disagreement among them, as is natural. But all testified that the credit situation is extremely serious, indeed that it is declining and deteriorating day by day, hour by hour, and the Congress is going to be forced to act to avoid a complete disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this has been helpful to my colleagues, and I hope they will keep these comments in mind as they consider the farm bill this week and next week and farm credit legislation that I expect will come before the Congress before we adjourn this year.

Mr. Speaker, under my unanimous-consent request to include extraneous matter, I include the entire text of the testimony I have quoted, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN RYAN, THE ST. PAUL DISTRICT FARM CREDIT COUNCIL

Thank you, Congressman. I appreciate the opportunity to talk to you about Farm Credit. First of all, I'd like to introduce myself, I'm John Ryan, a corn and soybean farmer, with a hog, farrow to finish operation near Springfield, Minnesota. I am currently on the Board of Directors of the Federal Land Bank Association of St. James,

which is in southern Minnesota. I also serve on the District Board of the Seventh Farm Credit District which includes the states of North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin and Michigan as well as on the St. Paul District Farm Credit Council Board, for which I'd like to speak today.

I'd like to first tell a little bit about the Farm Credit System. The Farm Credit System is a national agricultural lending cooperative, owned by farmers. On behalf of these over one million farmers nationwide, Farm Credit System's purpose is to collectively raise money in the nation's money markets and bring that capital back to rural communities and individual farmers. We also have the charge to provide credit and related services to farmers and their cooperatives at competitive rates through both good and bad times.

The Seventh Farm Credit District, the largest of the System's twelve districts, is committed to the Farm Credit System's mission. To ensure that the district remains in a viable financial position to be able to carry out the mission, the Seventh District recently adopted a seven point plan to control its costs, decrease losses and enhance farmer confidence. These seven points are focused on cost control, high return on assets, alternative loan programs and competitive prices for farmers, continued consolidation of Production Credit Association and Federal Land Bank Association management operations into 23 farmer controlled Farm Credit Service Centers and effective capital management. We support legislation that helps farmers and their Farm Credit System, and are committed to communicate regularly and openly with stockholders and other publics. I have an attachment which further explains this plan. (Attachment A)

Through a decade of inflation, today's low farm income and commodity prices are resulting in high debt to asset ratios and rapidly declining land and asset values. Farmers and their lenders did not, by their own choice, fail. Many others, including governmental ag policy, universities, and the public have had a role in causing this dilemma of over-valued assets and more debt than farmers can repay under existing and forecasted prices.

As an agricultural lending cooperative whose portfolio is totally in agriculture, the Farm Credit System has fewer options for offsetting our losses than other commercial lenders. Consequently, Farm Credit can only pass the losses from some of its borrowers onto all other borrowers through higher interest rates. Further, Farm Credit cannot simply turn its back on the ag sector when times are difficult and pursue more profitable ventures as some commercial lenders now in fact are doing. We have been in agriculture for over 60 years; we are in agriculture today; and we intend to stay in agriculture for many years to come. Our loan portfolio mirrors the economic strength of agriculture. When farmers are doing well, our portfolio reflects that. Conversely, when farmers are not doing well, the strength of our loan portfolio similarly declines. Therefore, if the Farm Credit System is to continue as a healthy, farmer-directed ag lending system, it is incumbent upon us to work to ensure a healthy agricultural economy.

To help farmers survive the current depression in agriculture and to keep a farmer-directed Farm Credit System to serve farmers today and tomorrow, the Seventh Farm Credit District through the Farm Credit Council, has developed policies

on several issues of importance and concern to farmer-owners. A copy of these issues is attached. (attachment B)

The Farm Credit System started with public capital assistance and over time, the farmers of America paid it back and built a reliable, dependable, efficient farmer-directed system that supplies over a third of all ag credit used in America. Today, we in the St. Paul District feel that the Farm Credit System is at a point where it might need that public capital again. Farmers alone should not have to bear the total costs of supporting the agricultural depression through higher interest rates because of factors beyond their control. The Seventh District supports legislative policies that will enable farmers to earn an income that will support their investments in their farming operation. We support public or government capital assistance through the Farm Credit System while ensuring continued farmer control. Such assistance should reduce the interest rates for all farmers while providing extended options for other deserving farmers who are having difficulty making ends meet. Congressman Weber has introduced a concept that could be key to meeting this objective. In his proposal to allow the Farm Credit System to sell tax exempt and/or guaranteed bonds. This would generate capital at a lower cost to farmers. We also support giving regulatory authorities to the Farm Credit Administration that are equal to authorities given to other financial regulatory organizations.

Unfortunately, these are stressful times for both lenders and borrowers; and it looks like it will continue to be stressful. We anticipate the trends will worsen until we have in place some long-term national solutions. We foresee no quick answer, just as we foresee no quick turn around to the agriculture crisis. The solution to our problems lies with reversing two of the most detrimental trends facing farmers in the 1980's, low commodity prices and declining land values. These two factors, in large part, influence farm income, which in turn determine a farmer's austerity or prosperity. The main problem is farm income not farm credit.

To give you better idea of how asset values, commodity prices and debt determine a profit or loss, I've included an attachment that will show you the effects of these factors in two time periods on three different types of farms. It illustrates how highly leveraged farmers could profit in the 1970's, yet lose substantially in the 1980's. These farmers were making the right decisions at that time given those circumstances. (attachment B)

We and our borrowers are doing everything possible to cut costs, service our loans and otherwise help farmers and our associations weather the tide of this economic depression. In spite of this and even with our strong capital base and the resources we have available in the Seventh District, we really question whether the System can work its total problems out working with only our own resources and with a majority of our increased cost burden borne by our farmer owners.

I'd like to give you a few specifics of what is happening in our District this year. The Seventh District is anticipating at least \$170 million in loan losses this year—\$100 million for Federal Land Bank and \$70 million for PCA. These reflect farmer's losses; farmers involved with that credit and are also experiencing losses. Farmers are increasingly unable to service debt on many of their loans. Non-performing assets are expected

to total about \$605 million—\$400 million for FLB; \$200 million for PCA, and \$5 million for Bank for Cooperatives. That affects our earnings: Our earnings in 1984 for the Seventh District amounted to \$122 million. Right now, even though we have increased our Land Bank interest rate during the past few months, we are projecting a \$7 million dollar loss in 1985 compared to \$122 million we earned in 1984. Our objective is to lower this rate as soon as possible. However, with these projected losses, without outside help, this won't be possible.

If we look at our Production Credit Associations across the southern tier of Minnesota counties, of which most are in Congressman Weber's district, we would find that barely 50% of our loans at the current time are classified acceptable. This means that nearly half of our loans are in the problem and vulnerable class and almost 20% of the loans we have are considered loss loans at this time. Our 1985 PCA foreclosures in the state of Minnesota are currently at 57 compared to 15 we had in 1984. We have also had 86 farmers declare bankruptcy compared to 32 last year. This does not take into consideration the acquired property which we have, which was deeded directly to the Land Banks and the PCAs throughout the state.

We have made a commitment in the Seventh District to continue to serve the farmers as best we can by keeping all of our associations offices open, by protecting the B-stock to the highest degree possible by use of capital management, merger and so forth. We feel that we are in this together and will work together to solve the problem together.

These efforts alone are not enough to swing the pendulum back to a more profitable, less stressful agriculture. It will take more than just state or local answers and solutions. As I mentioned earlier, it will require national answers, cooperation and a commitment from you, myself, your congressional peers and our borrowers. We have made that commitment and support your continued efforts to help solve our problems.

We must act together to ensure agriculture remains a viable industry here in southern Minnesota and throughout all other farming communities across rural America. Reasonable profits, stable asset values and manageable interest rates is what the American farmer needs. It's what he deserves and with your help, it's what he will get.

Thank you. I'll be glad to answer any question you might have.

STATEMENT BY LESLIE W. PETERSON, PRESIDENT, FARMERS STATE BANK OF TRIMONT, TRIMONT, MN

The financial condition of the agricultural sector is critical and continues to deteriorate, more rapidly now, particularly in the mid-section of the country.

This deterioration continues exacerbated by negative real income flows to farmers and the resultant decline in farm asset values that provide the security behind farm loans.

Several studies of this credit crisis in agriculture have been done; by the Federal Reserve, the USDA, the "Farm Journal" and just recently a report commissioned by the National Corn Growers Association and Pioneer Hi-bred International, Inc. This study was done in cooperation with the Farm Journal Magazine, FAPRI at Iowa State University and the University of Missouri

and Wharton Econometrics Forecasting Associates.

These studies further verify the credit problems found in country banks in southwestern Minnesota and the farm credit system. Of the 211 billion in total farm debt, half is under stress and one third in serious trouble. The latter study shows 27 percent of the farm debt is held by 14 percent of the farm operators with debt to asset ratios of over 70 percent. This group will find it difficult or impossible to correct their problems. The losses that will be realized by farm lenders with this group of borrowers will approach 25 billion.

The farm credit crisis is rapidly being transferred to the lending industry along with the responsibility for determining who remains farming. Lenders are finding the task of determining who remains farming extremely difficult because there is no price support structure in place to base projections on.

The losses realized after liquidation of these farm operations will be assumed by the lenders. These losses are in turn passed on to the good borrowers in the form of higher interest rates and fees. These imposed responsibilities on lenders are a primary reason many are withdrawing from the farm credit field and even rural communities. (Example—1st Bank System)

The credit crisis with loan defaults and the resulting losses adversely impact all lenders and more specifically country banks in many ways:

There is a public loss of confidence in the private financial institutions. Deposits will move elsewhere or above market rates will have to be paid to retain them. The farm credit system is already experiencing this increased cost of funds in the market which is passed on to borrowers.

Above market loans rates must be charged to off set losses and loans on non-accrual. This drives the good customer to competing sources of credit and financial services.

Legal defense costs and bankruptcies become a significant part of the cost of lending.

Personnel costs to properly supervise marginal credits and monitor the lenders security position escalate. (Example—compliance with the farm product exception to the Uniform Commercial Code changes)

Insurance companies are withdrawing from the country bank market for Directors and Officers Liability and Bankers Blanket Bond insurance. The increased cost of the coverages impact the profitability of country banks and can force a bank to close if coverage cannot be obtained.

Inability to obtain Directors and Officers Liability coverage makes it difficult to impossible to retain good directors in a county bank.

The stress imposed upon lending officers makes it difficult to retain good people in these positions.

Losses impair the capital of banks, reduce dividends, and cause a loss of confidence in country banks and their ability to serve their communities.

This farm financial crisis is building on itself. As net farm income declines, the ability of farmers to service debt is reduced leading to more liquidation of land and other assets and lower land values. We don't see an end to this cycle. These conditions increase the number of insolvent farmers and the magnitude of loan losses to lenders.

This cycle of deterioration has to be stopped before farm asset values are totally destroyed and with it, the total infra-structure supporting agriculture, including the farm lenders.

ture supporting agriculture, including the farm lenders.

This cycle of deterioration can only be stopped with government intervention. Intervention can take one of two forms or a combination:

A direct infusion of capital to farm lenders to stabilize their situation and enable them to hold land and other acquired assets off the market.

Income support levels to farm producers to enable them to service debt in an orderly manner.

There is presently no flow of new capital into the ag sector and rural America. The two principal sources of this capital have dried up completely, namely—

Net income from farm operations.

Flow of new capital from lenders and investors in financing the purchase of land and other farm assets into the hands of new owners and operators.

The capital base of agriculture and rural communities is continuing to shrink and with it the deposit base of rural banks. This coupled with loan losses and their effect on a banks capital will seriously impair the country bank's ability to meet the credit needs of the community. Without a reliable source of capital and credit, rural communities will wither and die.

Survival of 25% of our farmers is in doubt. Survival of the rural credit system is in doubt. Without these, survival of the rural community itself is in doubt.

The potential negative economy-wide effects of this farm financial crisis call for direct and comprehensive measures by Government to address the problem. The first of these measures essential to correct the problem is passage of farm legislation—as quickly as possible—that will assure stability of income to agriculture at levels high enough to stop the cycle of asset value deterioration that is destroying the economy of rural America.

NORTH MANKATO, MN,
September 3, 1985.

Representative TOM DASCHLE,
Rayburn Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Representative VIN WEBER,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SIR: The following is being submitted for the record of the hearings on the farm crisis, September 3, 1985, Worthington, MN.

My interest in providing testimony stems from several factors. I was raised on a diversified farming operation, my doctoral dissertation was done on agricultural policy and farm interest groups, and members of my immediate family who farm have had to sell out this year.

Many statistics indicate the consequence of high interest rates, declining farm land prices, and declining farm commodity prices over the past several years relative to farms, rural communities, and the State of Minnesota. According to United States Department of Agriculture figures, 4 out of every 10 counties in Minnesota are dependent on farming (these counties rely on farms for at least 20 cents out of every dollar of income) (Minneapolis Star and Tribune, 12 August 1985, p. 13A). Also, in Minnesota, approximately one in four jobs is related to agriculture and are divided between metropolitan areas and rural areas as follows:

Farms employ the equivalent of about 100,000 people.

Forty-eight thousand people are involved in food manufacturing.

Three hundred thousand people are indirectly dependent on farming—wholesalers, retailers, truckers, suppliers of farm materials and sellers of services such as lenders, insurance, and real estate (Minneapolis Star and Tribune, 12 August 1985, p. 13A).

The farm crisis will take its toll on farmers and businesses. In Minnesota alone, the state economist predicts 5,000 farmers will leave in the next five years, nearly 10,000 will go out of business in the 1990's, even if price supports remain in place (Minneapolis Star and Tribune, 11 August 1985, p. 25A). Finally, for every 6 farmers who go broke, one nonfarm business is closed (Mankato Free Press, 1985). Clearly, such figures are very significant and beg our attention. They still, however, do not capture the trauma and devastation rural Americans have been facing in their personal lives the past several years and will have to face in the near term if the Reagan Administration and Congress does not immediately address the needs of these people.

Given the above background, I would like to speak to the human dimension that gets lost in the shuffle of data. As noted earlier, members of my family have had to sell out of the farming business during the past eight months. What is this like? How does it impact a family and a community?

In my case, two of my brothers sold out (one totally, one partially) in February, 1985. At Christmas time, 1984, my brother, who partially sold out, told me he was having difficulty obtaining loans to plant his spring crop. He expressed he had recently found out about his financial problem, but he was only able at that time to discuss it with his wife and myself. It seemed this once confident and outgoing young farmer was having great difficulties expressing his deep concerns. This man and his wife had been farming since about 1974 and had faced other farm related problems before—hail, drought, animal diseases—but this one had them trapped. They had been facing high interest rates since 1980 and farm land prices had been declining for a year, so their borrowing power was decreasing while production costs continued to increase.

I was deeply disturbed by this brother's revelation—if he could not secure a loan, he would have to sell out. During the month of January, Karin, my wife, and I made numerous phone calls and visits to this brother and his family who lived 150 miles from our home in North Mankato, MN. I, too, tried to find capital for my brother. As time went on and time ran out, the emotional stress became very severe. On several occasions between Christmas, 1984 and the day of my brothers' sale, February 16, 1985, we all shed some tears.

It became apparent about mid-January my youngest brother would have to also sell out. As the time approached for my brothers' sale and money to borrow could not be found, tension in our families' homes heightened. Noticeably, my parents did not wish to discuss what my brothers were doing for work on their farms. This was so unlike in the past when my father and mother would gladly strike up a conversation immediately upon our arrival at their home and converse about the daily events on their sons' farms.

Finally, the day of the sale arrived. It was like going to a funeral of your best friend. The three hour sale wiped out what it took our family 30 years to accumulate and develop in livestock and machinery. It was one

of the most devastating moments of our lives. I watched tractors, combines, a swather, etc., we had used from dawn to dusk, day in and day out liquidated in minutes and seconds. I watched two young farmers and one weary father fight back tears and anger time and again as their lives built on sweat, hopes, and dreams were snuffed by what they understood as the auctioneer's cry and the buyer's highest bid. In retrospect we know it was not necessarily poor management, but instead forces beyond their control that dashed their dreams and crippled their confidence.

Just because farm sales are held and businesses go broke does not mean the problems are resolved. Subsequent to my brothers' sale, my youngest brother and sister-in-law have worked even more hours than before their farm crisis at a steak house. This means more time away from their two young sons and less family time together. My brother, who partially sold out, has taken on more acreage to try to offset the decline in commodity prices and continued high interest rates. This prevents him from having more time with his wife and three children. Despite his 11 years of hard work, attempting to save his land and livelihood, he seems to be waging a losing battle. Because of their financial status, these two families now qualify to receive free government commodities, e.g., cheese. Each brother has also reduced their social and community activities to save money. Finally, an outgrowth of the decimation of farmers and rural communities is the crumbling of the value of these good citizens. Just two weeks ago when I inquired of my sister-in-law how things were going in her neighborhood, she stated people were more out for themselves and less trusting of their neighbors as to whether repayment for things borrowed would occur. Though not members of my own family, I know farmers who have quit attending church and community functions because of pride and personal conflicts as a result of the economic conditions in rural America today.

In summary, rural Americans, be they a farmer, housewife, teacher, laborer, student, or small town businessperson, are more than bits of data. They are first class citizens that possess and nurture the spirit of America that began with our Founding Fathers and has continued to serve as the foundation of this Nation. That spirit embodies individualism, creativity, neighborliness, a strong work ethic, and patriotism. Every time a farmer or business goes broke in rural America the spirit of America is diminished. Does it make sense to cut away the business, social, and religious fabric that undergirds the soul of this Nation for the sake of cheap foreign labor and cheap food. I submit to you history will judge harshly those that measure the greatness of a nation based on financial statements and balance sheets while ignoring the irreparable harm being done to the social structure and family institution in rural America.

Sincerely yours,

ALLAN WIESE.

TESTIMONY OF GARY SONSTEGARD
DIFFICULTIES WITH FARM CREDIT FOR
BORROWERS AND LOAN OFFICERS

We, as lenders, are very concerned about the future of agriculture in its present state. We are a small farm bank in western Minn. and the majority of our customers are either farmers or people who directly depend on agriculture for their income. Inability of our customers to generate a profit

because of poor markets, weather conditions, heavy debt and high interest rates has caused large problems. This has caused deterioration of values on equipment, farm real estate, and livestock and the majority of our borrowers, who were in good shape several years ago, are now in financial trouble. As the farm situation deteriorates, the banks are under constant pressure from regulators to keep capital at a certain level, to shore-up problem loans, and to keep loss reserves at higher than normal levels. This causes us to keep rates higher than they should be in order to survive. Risk in our portfolios increase as this downward spiral of lower values and unprofitability continues. Lenient bankruptcy laws and all the other legal entanglements just complicate the situation. We have all been a part of causing this present situation. Farmers, government, financial institutions, you go down the list, but the important thing is that we do not dwell on who is to blame, but that we all pull together and do something to address and correct this situation.

We were able to get most of our farmers in the field this spring because we applied early for Approved Lenders Status under the FmHA Loan Guarantee Program and the majority of our operating loans have been guaranteed by FmHA in 1985. We had some difficulties getting the program started as both FmHA and ourselves were new to all the rules and documentation, but once the program got rolling, we were fairly successful in handling most of the requests that we had. We are optimistic that most of these operating funds will be repaid from sale of crop or selling of grain through Commodity Credit as we have the potential of a very good crop in the field in our area. We are concerned about the weather because we do need some time for this crop to reach its full potential. As we all know, prices have dropped drastically since spring. At that time on most of our cashflow projections, we were estimating wheat to be \$3.75 per bushel, it is presently \$3.32; soybeans to be \$6.30 per bushel, which is presently \$4.79; and corn to be \$2.65 per bushel, which is presently close to the \$2.02 mark for new crop. As you can see, if it was not for the big crop (15-25 percent over our projection) we would be in trouble as far as even getting our operating loans repaid. We are fortunate that the majority of our customers are in the program but are very concerned of what lies ahead with price levels being what they are at currently. It is going to be impossible for farmers to cash flow their operation at current price levels for 1986. This includes livestock loans. We feel we need a continuation of this guarantee program and we need to have it funded in all areas of agriculture lending, not only operating and farm equipment but also farm real estate.

Another area of concern of ours is the unavailability of long-term credit for farming. At the present it is my understanding that there are no farm ownership funds available through FmHA. In 1985 I think only five farm ownership loans were made in Chipewa County and I know there are 25-30 applications pending. Federal Land Bank and the insurance companies who are the other sources of long-term credit, for all practical purposes, are out of the market. Their requirements that the borrower must show profitability on his tax returns over the last several years, plus their lowering of appraisals on farm land and the amount they will borrow against this land has made it impossible for farmers to get any credit from this source. We are a short-term lending institu-

tion as we have to try to match up our loans with our deposits and therefore, it is impossible for us to make any long-term credit commitments which is something that most of our borrowers need desperately. We must have a source of long-term credit at low interest rates in order for our borrowers to work out of this very serious situation. If the present debt cannot be restructured and given a chance to work out we will begin seeing many more farm sales, foreclosures, and this will lead to a further depression. Close behind this will be failures of many farm banks and right behind this many farm communities. We hope that the Congress and the President will see fit to continue the FmHA Guarantee Program as we see this as an avenue to allow banks to continue to keep our farmers in business.

Another area of concern is interest rates. I know in our area the interest rates have not dropped as dramatically as the prime rate for farm borrowers. The major reason for this is the risk involved in each bank's portfolio and unless we keep our spread between the rates we are paying and the rates we are receiving, we will also be in trouble as a lending institution. We have to continue to generate profits in order to cover and make allowance for potential loan losses in our portfolio.

The other part of this problem is profitability on the farm level. At current prices it is almost impossible for any farmers to cash flow his operation. In 1984 in going through our own credit files, we can see from the farmers tax returns that were submitted to us, 90 percent of them lost money. We need a price so that farmers can make a profit and remain in business. If not, I can see, as I stated before, farmers, businesses, and financial institutions dependent upon agriculture will fail like dominoes. This in turn will cause many rural communities to become ghost towns. I don't think the government or anyone else wants to see this. Agriculture has been and is the back-bone of our country. It is still directly related to 40 percent of our economy yet only 3 percent of our Federal Budget is spent on farm programs. In reality, we are not subsidizing the farmer, we are subsidizing the consumer. We have the cheapest food in the world. I have seen several studies that peg 15 percent of our disposable income is spent for food while 25-35 percent of disposable income is spent in almost all other countries. If we want to continue to have cheap food, then we cannot penalize the farmer, who is the most efficient operator in the world. If the farmer can make a profit, he will pay taxes, buy goods and services, create employment and in turn our whole economy will be better off. I would venture to say that whatever the Government spends on farm programs, a good portion of this would come back in taxes, reduced unemployment benefits, increased sales taxes to states and probably the most important, the continuation of a rural society that will continue to grow and prosper and be the back-bone of our country. What would be the cost of re-training and relocating this society? If the present trend continues the economic and social structure we now have with the family farms and small businesses and rural communities will be a thing of the past.

Our farm customers, for the most part, are usually very optimistic people. This is not the case now. They are, to put it frankly, depressed just like the economy. They feel there is little hope. They feel the administration has abandoned them. They

cannot give their children any hope of a future in farming as they see little hope for themselves. The majority of these are good farmers who enjoy their work and take pride in it. The pressure put on them by the situation is almost too much to bear. A sign of the times, was last winter when about one-half of all farm meetings had to do with stress and how to handle it. I dread the thought of what this winter will be like if nothing is done to bolster the farm economy.

In summary, we need the following things:
Short term:

(1) A continuation of the Government guarantee program in all areas of ag credit, operating, expenses, equipment and real estate.

(2) Interest rates and terms that will allow the farmers to work themselves out of the present credit dilemma. (This would start with funds available for low interest FmHA farm ownership programs.)

(3) Price supports or some sort of price stability that would allow farmers to make a profit and to cash flow his operation.

(4) Government and the consumer must be educated to know what the consequences of a failure in the ag economy would mean.

Long term:

(1) We need a farm program that is consistent and stable. Farmers cannot continue to make 20-year investments based on three or four year programs.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 3373, THE CALIFORNIA OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF PROTECTION AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which seeks to restore an important measure of balance and certainty to the process of developing and protecting California's offshore resources. The past 4 years have been characterized by growing conflict and confrontation between the Congress and the administration over the issue of leasing the State's Outer Continental Shelf for oil and gas development.

Seeking a long-term resolution of this conflict, a bipartisan group of Members of the California delegation entered into negotiations with Interior Secretary Hodel in early June in order to break the deadlock on the issue. After 6 weeks of good faith negotiations, the Secretary joined the Members, including Senators CRANSTON and WILSON, in announcing what he termed "a landmark agreement" on the status of the offshore lands currently protected by a congressional moratorium on oil and gas leasing.

The process of negotiation involved compromise and sacrifice on both sides. The preliminary agreement which was announced on July 16 provides the balance between protection and development which was called for in the OCS Lands Act Amendments of 1978. It embodies safeguards to pro-

tect the \$16 billion tourism industry and the \$1.75 billion commercial fishing industry—industries which depend upon a nonindustrialized coastal zone and an unpolluted marine environment. At the same time it provides for the expanded hydrocarbon resource development which will make California the Nation's second largest producer of offshore oil by 1990.

Unfortunately, the Secretary recently announced that the resource information provided to the congressional negotiators was basically incorrect and that he would have to abandon the original terms of the agreement. However, a bipartisan majority of the California delegation, including both Senators, continues to support the balanced approach represented by the preliminary accord, and have committed themselves to implementing this agreement, with or without the Secretary's support.

Our hope now, as it has been over the past 4 years, is to see a process established which makes extraordinary congressional involvement in this issue unnecessary. The present approach is allowing the oil companies to dictate national policy on OCS development. Pursuant to the wishes of the majority of the coastal counties, 25 coastal cities, a number of State legislators, the attorney general, the Lieutenant Governor, and 75 percent of the California congressional delegation which support this agreement, I am introducing this long-term legislation to implement the original July accord.

Given the Secretary's rejection of the agreement, I believe that it is now the legislative mandate of the Congress to inact the agreement which the Secretary made with the California Members. Like the pact announced with Secretary Hodel, this legislation will:

One, open 150 of the tracts currently protected by moratorium for leasing and development.

Two, protect the remaining areas until the year 2,000, except in the event of a national energy emergency.

Three, permit the drilling of one exploratory well in each of three northern basins—Santa Cruz, Bodega, and Point Arena—in order to inventory the resource in those areas.

I would prefer to be introducing this legislation with the support of Secretary Hodel. Without the Secretary's backing of a compromise approach, the Nation's OCS Leasing and Development Program will continue to be stalled in the Congress and in the courts. California's coastal communities, the Nation, and future generations of Americans deserve an offshore development policy which provides for a reasonable balance between environmental and economic concerns and which insures a reasonable amount of

certainty over the pace of development.

An agreement was reached which provides the required balance and certainty to the process of developing California's offshore resources, and which has engendered the support of the State's coastal communities, local and State government officials, and the majority of its congressional representatives. We cannot back away from this agreement, and therefore must move to implement it.

The following is the text of H.R. 3373:

H.R. 3373

A bill imposing certain limitations and restrictions on leasing lands on the Outer Continental Shelf off the State of California, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "California Outer Continental Shelf Protection and Development Act".

SEC. 2. CALIFORNIA OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASING.

(a) APPLICATION.—The provisions of this Act shall apply to submerged lands of the California outer Continental Shelf described in subsection (b).

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LANDS.—Lands to which this Act applies shall be tracts within the following areas:

(1) the lands within the Department of the Interior Central and Northern California Planning Area which lie north of the line between the row of blocks numbered N816 and the row of blocks numbered N817 of the Universal Transverse Mercator Grid System;

(2) an area of the Department of the Interior Southern California Planning Area bounded by the following line on the California (Lambert) Plane Coordinate System: From the point of intersection of the international boundary line between the United States and Mexico and the seaward boundary of the California State Tidelands west along said international boundary line to the point of intersection with the line between the row of blocks numbered 28 west and the row of blocks numbered 27 west; thence north to the northeast corner of block 20 north, 28 west; thence northwest to the southwest corner of block 29 north, 35 west; thence north along the line between the row of blocks numbered 36 west and the row of blocks numbered 35 west to its intersection with the seaward boundary of the California State Tidelands; thence easterly along the seaward boundary of the California State Tidelands to the point of beginning;

(3) a portion of the Department of the Interior Southern California Planning Area which lies both: (A) east of the line between the row of blocks numbered 53 west and the row of blocks numbered 52 west, and (B) north of the line between the row of blocks numbered 34 north and the row of blocks numbered 35 north, on the California (Lambert) Plane Coordinate System;

(4) the boundaries of the Channel Island National Marine Sanctuary, as defined by title 15, part 935.3 of the Code of Federal Regulations; and

(5) the boundaries of Santa Barbara Channel Ecological Preserve and Buffer

Zone, as defined by the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management Public Land Order numbered 4587 (vol. 34, page 5655 Federal Register March 26, 1969).

SEC. 3. AREAS AVAILABLE FOR LEASING.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Of the lands described in section 2(b), oil and gas leasing may be carried out under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act as provided in this section with respect to lands described in subsection (b).

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LANDS.—The lands referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

(1) In the Eel River Basin area those tracts described, using the Universal Transverse Mercator Grid System, by the following coordinates:

Row N939, E71, E74, E75.
Row N940, E71-E72, E74-E76.
Row N941, E71-E76.
Row N942, E71-E76.
Row N943, E71-E76.
Row N944, E71-E76.
Row N945, E71-E76.
Row N946, E71-E74.
Row N947, E71-E74.
Row N948, E71-E74.
Row N949, E71-E74.
Row N950, E70-E74.
Row N951, E69-E74.
Row N952, E69-E74.
Row N953, E69-E74.
Row N954, E69-E74.
Row N955, E69-E74.
Row N956, E69-E74.
Row N957, E69-E74.

(2) In the Santa Maria Basin area, those tracts described, using the Universal Transverse Mercator Grid System, by the following coordinates:

Row N817, E125-E132.
Row N818, E126-E132.
Row N819, E129-E130.

(3)(A) In the Santa Monica Bay area, those tracts described, using the California (Lambert) Plane Coordinate System Zone 6, by the following coordinates:

Row N41, W½ of W52.
Row N40, W52.
Row N39, W52.
Row N38, W52.
Row N36, W41-W42.
Row N35, W36-W43, S½ of W44, S½ of W45.

(B) Those tracts, or portions of tracts, lying within the following described area, using the California (Lambert) Plane Coordinate System Zone 6: Beginning at the northwest corner of that tract described as Row N37, W52; thence south to the southwest corner of that tract described as Row N35, W52; thence east to the southeast corner of that tract described as Row N35, W46; thence northwest to the northeast corner of that tract described as Row N37, W52; thence west to the point of beginning.

(4) In the Camp Pendleton area, those tracts described, using the California (Lambert) Plane Coordinate System Zone 6, by the following coordinates:

Row N25, W27.
Row N26, W25-W27.
Row N27, W26.

(c) CONDITIONS.—

(1) LEASING SUBJECT TO APPLICABLE LAW.—Leasing and all post-lease activities permitted under this Act shall be carried out in accordance with the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and other applicable Federal, State, and local law.

(2) MINIMIZE IMPACT.—Leasing and all post-lease activities permitted under this Act shall be carried out in a manner so as to minimize the environmental, economic, and

social impacts of activities related to such leasing.

SEC. 4. AREAS AVAILABLE FOR EXPLORATION.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, one Continental Off-Structure Stratigraphic Test well may be authorized under applicable law in each of the following three areas:

(1) in the Point Arena area on those lands which lie between, but do not include, the row of blocks numbered N890 and the row of blocks numbered N922 of the Universal Transverse Mercator Grid System;

(2) in the Bodega Bay area on those lands which lie between, but do not include, the row of blocks numbered N869 and the row of blocks numbered N891 of the Universal Transverse Mercator Grid System; and

(3) in the Santa Cruz area on those lands which lie between, but do not include, the row of blocks numbered N851 and the row of blocks numbered N870 of the Universal Transverse Mercator Grid System.

(b) RESTRICTION.—No well may be authorized pursuant to subsection (a) which is closer than 18 miles from the shoreline.

SEC. 5. AREAS AVAILABLE FOR EMERGENCY LEASING ONLY.

(a) NECESSARY CONDITIONS.—Exploration, development or production activities, and drilling shall be allowed by lease or permit or otherwise under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act with respect to submerged lands described in section 2(b), but not described in section 3(b), only if the President—

(1) finds under section 161(d) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6241(d)) that a drawdown and distribution from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is required by a severe energy supply interruption;

(2) finds that such a drawdown and distribution would be insufficient to meet such severe energy supply interruption; and

(3) finds that issuing such specific leases or allowing such specific activities would contribute significantly to the alleviation of the energy emergency resulting from such severe energy supply interruption.

(b) FOREIGN ENERGY CRISIS.—Leasing shall not be permitted under this section if the severe energy supply interruption referred to in subsection (a)(1) is attributable to treaty obligations of the United States to assist foreign countries in the event of their energy emergency.

(c) TERMINATION OF LEASING ACTIVITIES.—(1) TERMINATION.—Leasing activities permitted under this section shall terminate unless—

(A) during the drawdown and distribution described in subsection (a)(1), the President renews his findings under subsection (a) at least once every 6 months; and

(B) when such drawdown and distribution terminates, and at least once every 6 months thereafter, the President renews his finding under subsection (a)(3).

(2) DISPOSITION.—When leasing activities are terminated under paragraph (1)—

(A) tracts which have been leased pursuant to this section, and with respect to which the Secretary of the Interior has determined that substantial development and production expenditures have been made after such lease was issued, may remain leased under the terms of the original lease, and such lease may be renewed under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, but if the original lessee abandons leasing activities, such tracts may not be re-offered for

lease until the necessary conditions described in subsection (a) exist again; and

(B) all other tracts shall be subject to the provisions of this Act, and any lease previously issued with respect to such tracts shall be cancelled under section 5(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1334(a)).

SEC. 6. EXPIRATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.

This Act shall cease to be effective as of January 1, 2000.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this special order today to speak about an issue that affects all Americans. Many times we take the floor in this body and talk about special interests and limited groups of people, but the issue I am going to address today affects us all, and that is the issue and the problem of illegal immigration. And I emphasize the words, "illegal immigration."

This is a highly charged, hotly debated, and a very emotional issue. The other body is in the process of considering a major immigration reform bill, and the House Judiciary Committee has begun hearings over here on this issue.

In addition, I have introduced in April of this year my own immigration bill, H.R. 2267, which at this time has 13 cosponsors. People might ask, why does a Congressman from the small State of New Hampshire get involved in an issue like immigration, an issue that is supposed to involve districts in Texas, California, and Florida?

Well, the answer is quite simple. As I stated in my opening remarks, it is a national issue, it is a national concern. We are being invaded, and America's borders have become so porous that we have lost control of our own country.

Illegal immigration is a problem that affects all Americans, not just certain sectors of the country. For example, let me cite this headline in the Manchester Union Leader, a local paper in my State, from Salem, NH: "16 people arrested at a park raid; drugs, illegal aliens charged."

Let me cite some more examples of why this is truly a national problem. "Border Patrol is troubled by attacks on agents from illegal aliens."

The Los Angeles Herald Examiner: "Factory raids net 180 more alleged illegal aliens while officials say illegals are causing crime."

From the Los Angeles Times: "INS holds 600 illegal aliens in sweep of six job locations." "936 arrested in week-long INS sweep of illegal alien workers."

□ 1455

Mr. Speaker, this is a national problem. The fact that Congress has not dealt with that problem is a national disgrace.

The number of illegals residing in America—how many? Nobody knows. Estimates range from 3.5 million to as many as 30 million, but you do not exactly get illegal aliens coming forth and saying, "Here I am, an illegal. Count me."

How can we grant amnesty when we do not know how many are eligible for amnesty?

Let me quote from a book entitled "The Immigration Timebomb," written by Palmer Stacy of the American Immigration Control Foundation:

How many illegal aliens are there in the United States? Because illegals hide from authorities, the exact number can never be known.

In mid-1975 a study commissioned by the INS estimated there were around 8 million illegal aliens in the United States.

A report entitled "Illegal Aliens Invasion Out of Control" in the U.S. News & World Report of January 29, 1979, said that as many as 12 million illegals may be in the United States today.

The Environmental Fund, an authoritative nonpartisan research organization that studies the impact of overpopulation concluded that New York City and Los Angeles together have more than 3 million illegal aliens.

Let us look at some interesting statistics. Apprehended aliens, that is apprehended aliens, in 1964 there were 86,000.

In 1965, 110,000.

In 1966, 138,000.

In 1967, 161,000.

In 1968, 212,000.

In 1969, 283,000.

In 1970, 345,000.

In 1971, 420,000.

In 1972, 505,000.

In 1973, 655,000.

In 1974, 788,000.

In 1975, 766,000.

In 1976, 875,000.

In 1977, 1 million plus.

In 1978, 1 million plus.

In 1979, 1 million plus.

In 1980, 910,000.

In 1981, 975,000.

In 1982, 970,000.

In 1983, 1.2 million.

I would assume from 1964 to 1985 that there were Congresses of the United States of America and it certainly does not sound like they were dealing with the problem of illegal aliens.

There were 12 to 13 million people apprehended and yet according to the INS statistics, only one in three is apprehended. You do not need to be a mathematician to figure out how many made it through who were illegal if you add up the fact that 12 to 13

million were apprehended and those were only one-third of the ones that actually came in.

Let us look at the cost of this problem. Why are we concerned? Why should we be concerned? Let us look at some of the myths.

Myth one: "Illegal aliens don't take high-paying jobs. They just take jobs Americans don't want."

Bunk, entirely wrong. According to Alan Nelson, Commissioner of the INS, 40 percent of illegal aliens apprehended at employment sites in 1984 were in high-paying jobs.

In a study conducted by Donald Huddle, he found that over 53 percent of the illegal aliens he interviewed occupied jobs that paid \$5 per hour and 12 percent were in jobs that paid over \$6 an hour.

In addition, Huddle found in a separate study of highway and construction workers that illegal aliens were commonly paid between \$8 and \$9 per hour.

Let us take a look at a quote from the Huddle study:

"Illegal Immigration Job Displacement and Social Costs" by Donald L. Huddle, Ph.D.

In a 1983 survey we found that undocumented "urban" emigrants, mostly Mexican nationals, were 38 percent of the total of 200 illegals interviewed. About 53 percent of the sample earned an hourly wage in excess of \$5 per hour and 12 percent earned more than \$6 per hour. Only 38 percent of the respondents were working as common laborers. The others were distributed among 14 trades.

In a 1982 field study of highway and commercial construction we found illegals commonly earned between \$8 and \$9 per hour as insulators, concrete finishers and painters.

Let us look at a second myth: "Illegal aliens are not a drain on the American economy."

The Huddle study is probably the best argument against this position. Let us look at a quote again for the same study:

No doubt consumer and real estate taxes paid by illegal aliens, even in rental housing, help to cover some of the costs, but this is offset by money immigrants send to the home country.

In their 1976 study, North and Houstoun estimated that 80 percent of illegal alien workers sent such remittances, an average of \$151 a month for each alien, and an average of \$129 per month for Mexican aliens.

Veteran immigration officers think it is reasonable to assume that undocumented Mexican workers alone, who may number 3 to 4 million, counting seasonal agricultural workers, may presently be sending \$3 billion a year in American dollars to Mexico.

In any case, if we were to total up the probable job displacement costs caused by undocumented workers in the American economy in 1982, that sum could easily be over \$30 billion.

Then one might add the cost of illegal aliens—still quoting from the Huddle survey:

One might add the cost of illegal aliens using taxpayer-supported programs. If one were to assume 9 million illegals with dependents in the United States in 1982, as we do, then the cost for such aliens in tax-supported programs would be close to \$5 billion. Here we accept the INS table as a range of plausible estimates. However, we believe that the next net tax contribution of undocumented aliens is probably much less than that indicated by the INS for the reasons given. The two costs taken together, that of displacement of U.S. workers and of illegals receiving tax-supported services, amount to approximately \$35 billion per annum. One may give or take a few billion, but by any measurement, by any set of assumptions, cheap alien labor considered from all angles, including structural employment, is anything but a subsidy for the American economy, society, and educational system.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Yes, I am happy to yield.

Mr. GEKAS. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman's excellent review of the statistics that are important to this issue. As a matter of fact, the gentleman is to be commended for placing into the RECORD the array of numbers that the gentleman is telling us about, because very little is being said around the Nation as to the monumental problem that we have that is being articulated.

I simply wish to state and to confirm what the gentleman has said about the seriousness of the problem.

The Federal Government of the United States or any Federal Government, any central government anywhere in the world, has as its primary responsibility the securing of its borders, as the gentleman has stated. That just goes without saying, to preserve national unity, national identity, national cohesiveness, the borders must be secure.

We have been lucky over the years to have a border with Canada which is self-regulating and which has had a history of excellence. The southern borders, however, and the Atlantic and Pacific borders, if you will, are porous, as the gentleman has said, and it is there where we must focus attention.

The President of the United States has put the full force of the White House right from the first moment of his incumbency into legislation that would shore up our borders. What he has said, and which the gentleman confirms, and again I commend the gentleman for it, is that it is no longer just a question of a policy that has to be dealt with. It is now a question of national security, because the unprecedented flow of illegal aliens within our country, whether it be 3 million or 30 million, as the gentleman has stated, constitutes a problem of national and domestic security. Even if

we did not have any trouble articulating the problems of jobs and the identity of them, their very presence in our midst, unaccounted for, not on the Social Security rolls, not on the accountability rolls on which every American appears in one way or another, that means that we have an internal security problem. Coupling that with the national security problem, which the gentleman just said, putting all that together, it does appall me, as it does the gentleman, why the Congress of the United States, throughout all these intervening years when the problem has been growing and festering and getting worse and worse, has not acted.

The 98th Congress, the one just concluded, did make a valiant attempt in one way to do it, but here we are again in the 99th Congress being pressured by the very people in some quarters whom we wish to help in these circumstances.

Employers, where we must have employer sanctions to make a bill work, worry about whether this is an infringement on their rights.

The people who are against amnesty, and I am very reluctant about the problem of amnesty, must realize that we cannot have a political solution to this unless some kind of amnesty be given, because there is no other solution.

So, where are we? We have employers fighting and business fighting employer sanctions, yet one of the solutions to the problem, one of the benefits of some kind of a program, would be to the benefit, it seems to me, of the business community if we stabilize this whole problem; yet, they oppose some of the employer sanctions which have to be a part of any broad bill.

The reason I interrupted the gentleman in this nice presentation is simply to try to join in the effort to bring this matter to the conscience of the U.S. Congress. We must do something. We must begin the debate.

We now have to wait for the other body to deliver, to conclude its deliberations, because they are in the midst of them; but, when the problem comes to us, let us move ahead and try to have a bill before we leave in November.

Immigration, the trade policy, deficit reduction, is an important issue and the House must deal with it.

Again, I am so happy that the gentleman has taken the time in these special orders, as I say, to fill the RECORD with these statistics that loom before us and which accent the monumental problem that we have.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Well, I thank the gentleman for participating. His remarks are certainly well taken.

I think as the gentleman correctly alluded to, when we have a situation

in America where this Congress does not hesitate at a moment's notice to try to deal with a domestic problem, as well it should, whether it be drugs, whether it be terrorism, internally, or whether it be agricultural problems, we seem to be overlooking the fact that some of the problems, many of the problems that are being caused here, are because we are unwilling or reluctant or perhaps do not have the courage to deal with these borders that we are faced with. I cannot understand why the Congress has not dealt with it. I think these statistics will back us up that the Congress has not dealt with it. They did make an attempt to deal with it, and although some of us, and I think I probably disagree with the gentleman slightly on amnesty; however, the important thing is let us get an immigration bill out.

I have taken this special order knowing full well that there are people who disagree with me on employer sanctions, which I support, and probably some disagree with me on not having amnesty, which I do not believe we should have; but the point is, let us get a bill. Let us argue it on the floor, but let us come out of here with a bill that is going to do something to stop basically this invasion of the United States of America.

It is not meant to be discriminatory against anybody. It just so happens that the borders to the south of us are the borders where most of the problem is coming from. I thank the gentleman.

I think there are two problems in addition to the obvious economic ones as we deal with the issue of illegal immigration which sometimes we overlook and need to be addressed.

Let us look at the drug problem as a result of illegal aliens. We can never expect to control the inflow of drugs into this country if we do not have control over our borders. We have a Select Committee on Narcotics and Drug Abuse and we print volumes of paper and we continue to fund that program or that committee every year. But why are we not willing to fund the INS sufficiently and to have the proper people on the borders to stop the flow of illegal drugs into this country? Then maybe we would not need a Committee on Narcotics.

In 1979, INS officers seized nearly 53 tons of marijuana while arresting aliens. That is just marijuana. That is not counting any other illegal drugs.

In 1984, according to testimony by Alan Nelson, over 50 million tons of narcotics were seized at the border. Since we only apprehend one in every three illegal aliens, we can assume the actual amount of illegal drugs is a heck of a lot more.

Let us look at Palmer Stacy's book again:

The millions of illegal aliens flooding our country by land, sea and air, clearly have little respect for our laws—

And I emphasize illegal aliens—

Their very presence shows that. Many bring illegal drugs with them as they come. In 1979, INS officers seized nearly 53 tons of marijuana while arresting illegal aliens. Gangs of Mexicans have repeatedly attacked Border Patrol officers with rocks and guns near the border. The Border Patrol has been forced to obtain some special armored vans—nicknamed "War Wagons"—in which to conduct border watches.

Many illegals engage in crime as soon as they are across the border. Charles Perez, INS director from the El Paso, Texas, area, says half of that city's downtown crime is related to illegal immigration. In Houston, more than 30 percent of the city's murders involve illegal aliens. And Denver Police Chief Art Dill notes that illegals who cannot quickly find work "steal to survive."

That is from Palmer Stacy.

□ 1510

Let us look at the LA Herald Examiner of Friday, June 17, 1985:

Factory Raids Net 180 More Alleged Aliens . . . While Officials Say Illegals are Causing Crime. Illegal aliens, once attracted to northern San Diego County by field labor, are now coming to burglarize homes in the area's well-to-do communities, authorities say.

We're dealing with illegal aliens as suspects in crimes in numbers that we've never seen before," Escondido police Lt. Mike Stein said.

Stein and other law enforcement officials blame the influx of aliens—estimated at about 1,000 a day—for the first increase in the county's crime rate in five years.

Deputy district attorneys in the North County Superior Court, which operates out of Vista, estimate that 25 percent of their cases involve illegal aliens.

Most of them come to work, but a lot of them come here for the sole purpose of robbing and stealing, Escondido police Detective Joe Santibanez said.

Let us look at another issue related to illegal aliens that a lot of us forget about. Very recently on the floor of this body, in a great deal of debate, we debated the issue of terrorism, about how we were going to stop it, and we were going to do everything we could to stop terrorism.

We could stop a heck of a lot of it by stopping the illegal aliens who come into this country. Obviously a terrorist who comes into America to blow up an airplane, to assassinate a figure, is not coming here illegally. In many cases, they are, believe it or not, but in most cases they are not.

On the threat of terrorism, a recent State Department report published in August of this year states that:

The Sandinista government has issued Nicaraguan passports to radicals and terrorists of other nationalities, including radicals from the Middle East, Latin America, and Europe, thus enabling them to travel in Western countries without their true identities being known.

Let us look again at the State Department report: The Sandinistas and

Middle Eastern Radicals, U.S. Department of State, dated August of 1985:

The Sandinista government has issued Nicaraguan passports to radicals and terrorists of other nationalities, including radicals from the Middle East, Latin America, and Europe, thus enabling them to travel in Western countries, without their true identities being known. PLO agents working in Central America and Panama use Nicaragua as their base of operations. The Sandinistas' willingness to provide new documentation and a base from which to travel is undoubtedly one reason why Nicaragua has become a haven for terrorists and radicals from Europe as well as Latin America. Groups with a known presence in Nicaragua include the Basque Homeland and Liberty organization, known as ETA, the German Baader-Meinhof Gang, and Italy's Red Brigades.

I think the information from the State Department itself certainly lends a great deal of credence to that argument.

Again, Mr. Stacy, in his book, "The Immigration Time Bomb," page 112, states "Business Week for December 21, 1981, reported on 'A Communist Push Along the Mexico Border,' and revealed that 'A revitalized Mexican Communist Party, invigorated by a new, young Cuban-trained and Soviet-schooled nucleus, is building an infrastructure in a group of towns on the Rio Grande along the Texas border. With the border region's festering problems of high unemployment, illegal immigration and drugs, U.S. officialdom is concerned about the development of a local political movement with ties to Havana and Moscow.'

Lax border security and loopholes in official U.S. immigration policy have opened the possibility for foreign terrorists or their Soviet, Cuban, Libyan and Iranian allies to infiltrate this country. New West magazine suggested that there may be as many as 300 Palestinian terrorists in the United States.

What are the solutions? Congress is great at debating solutions. But we do not very often come up with any. I think it is time we did. This is a major crisis, a major crisis in the United States of America, and we have got to deal with it.

Why are our borders out of control? Because, very frankly, INS simply does not have the manpower to handle the problem.

According to Palmer Stacy's book, there are more law enforcement officers working on Capitol Hill protecting Congress than there are border patrolmen guarding our southern border with Mexico. Think of that.

Let me quote from an article from the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, May 9, 1985.

INS troops are rapidly being overrun by a swelling tide of illegal immigrants. At any one time, there are fewer border patrol officers on duty along the 2,000-mile Mexican-American border than there are policemen on the day shift in Philadelphia. The INS has slightly more than a dozen immigration investigators in Houston to round up an estimated 500,000 illegal immigrants. Since 1972, the number of INS investigators in

Los Angeles has been more than halved, to 60 from 140, while the number of illegal immigrants living in the city is believed to have grown to between 500,000 and one million.

The illegal immigrants are ingenious in frustrating their outnumbered adversary. Some wear horseshoes to throw mounted pursuers off the track. A well-aimed rock from an illegal immigrant brought a low-flying INS helicopter crashing to the ground in Southern California a few years ago. When border patrolmen in Eagle Pass, Texas, planted sophisticated electronic detection devices along the Rio Grande, some Mexicans stole one and forced the Border Patrol to pay an intermediary a \$100 ransom to arrange for its return.

"When you're trying to stop a man who hasn't eaten in a day or two, you find he can be a very clever opponent," says Gene R. Smithburg, assistant chief patrol agent in the service's San Diego sector.

A couple of more lines from the Wall Street Journal article.

Mexicans and Central Americans aren't the only ones who penetrate America's soft underbelly. Last year, border patrolmen in the Rio Grande Valley of South Texas arrested illegal immigrants from 43 countries, including China, Korea and Poland. Agents in Los Angeles recently broke up a network that smuggled Indian Sikhs into the U.S. through Tijuana. "I come to work knowing I might meet anyone in the world," says Ed Barrett, a border patrolman in El Paso.

But there are just too many immigrants and too few border patrolmen.

It is as simple as that.

One more quote from the same article:

Despite the INS's high-tech wizardry, it still lacks many of the basic tools of law enforcement. In recent years, officers in the Dallas district have at times been told not to arrest illegal immigrants because there hasn't been enough money left in the budget to pay for the gasoline needed to drive them back to the border. In McAllen, Texas, officers are sometimes forced to release 20 to 30 illegal immigrants from Central America a day on their own recognizance because there isn't room to detain them in INS facilities or money to house them in the county jail; almost all of the illegal immigrants released without bond are never seen again.

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. DAUB. I am very pleased that my good friend and colleague, BOB SMITH, who has yielded to me is taking this time. As he may know from our prior conversations, and because of my cosponsorship of this legislation, I am very interested in the question of immigration reform and in the mechanism that we utilize to get more effective control of our borders. I think that is a common goal that we both share. So I want to commend the gentleman for his initiative on the reform bill.

H.R. 2267 does essentially four things, as I view it. It substantially increases the Immigration and Natural-

ization Service enforcement or border control with dollars, simply a cost that we are going to have to incur to get this job done correctly. It engages us in the pursuit of stricter employer sanctions on the civil side aimed at the employers who knowingly hire those undocumented workers. It absolutely foregoes the temptation of granting amnesty, which I think is an appropriate solution if other things can be worked into the legislation. And it contains H-2 provisions, or guestworker provisions denying immediate relative status to certain individuals as well who would have violated our immigration laws internationally.

I am proud to say that you and I are not alone. You have a number of cosponsors on this legislation, and in fact, I think the number will grow as we commence to focus on what the other body has been doing with respect to trying to come up with a bill that solves some of the problems.

I would like to call attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the *Christian Science Monitor* on Monday, September 9. I have a copy of it here which at the appropriate time I hope will be made a part of the *RECORD* and of this special order. I would refer to a number of the comments which I made which are quoted in that article with respect first to the issue of amnesty, which is the principal subject about which I would like to talk in this special order.

I make the following points:

That amnesty rewards lawbreakers. Why should illegal aliens become citizens when millions of legal aliens are waiting their turn to enter the United States?

I make the point that amnesty could be very costly. Public expenses for education, welfare, and other needs will soar, and who is going to pay for what we legislate if we are not careful?

I make the point that amnesty in its pure form, that is, blanket amnesty, across the board, as of a contemporary date, say 1984, or 1985, or 1986, will send the wrong signal. If the United States grants amnesty once, it may do so again. Other people will be encouraged to sneak across our borders, to swim, to walk, to drive or to fly on the theory that simply after the first wave has been legalized, then it is an assured signal that we will continue to do that very same kind of thing, and the invitation is more open, and the door is opened further.

Amnesty could set off a U.S. population explosion, and there are a number of my colleagues and I that are concerned about this. It is a bipartisan kind of thing. I am working now with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and we have a "Dear Colleague" letter out that indicates our interest in looking at the chain migration problem that results

from the legalization to the citizenship window, and then anywhere between 50 and 70 million additional persons that will legally be entitled to come in once the legal alien status is legalized, and that function of those numbers is so suffocating, and so staggering as the consequence of trying to be appropriate in addressing the concerns we have for those that are already here without legal status that we simply open Pandora's box. And we have made a very difficult situation even worse. There may be as many as 12 to 16 million illegal aliens today in the United States. Once they are citizens, and again I quote from the article by John Dillon, they could legally bring in millions of their relatives unless some kind of guards are put into the legislation with respect to brothers, sisters, mothers, fathers, spouses of each and their offspring.

□ 1525

If you run the multiplication factor, you get to those 50 to 70 million people figures just in a 15-year period once we would grant blanket amnesty. Another point that I am trying to make with respect to amnesty is that it could lead to resource problems in the Southwest. Most new immigrants would be expected to settle in California and other Western States. Water shortages indeed would become a problem and other kinds of elements like that. The next point I make is that amnesty takes pressure off other nations to solve their own problems. Mexico, for example, has a severe population problem, and as long as Mexico can use the United States as its safety valve there is little pressure to hold down its own population growth.

Lastly, I try to make a point that amnesty could damage the U.S. economy. The United States is moving toward a high-technology computerized, robotized kind of economy and absorbing those large numbers of unskilled workers from abroad would require the United States to develop a very different kind of economy.

Let me say that there are solutions within the range of the question of amnesty. I have been interested in an alternative which is a form of amnesty which is referred to as the registry date proposal. In fact, I offered a registry date mechanism which is a more realistic and more affordable solution to those aliens who are already here and who may be integrated already in their communities, those who are entitled to be recognized as productive and desirable additions to our population and are well on their way to every other goal that we would aspire to with respect to citizenship.

The present law provides a registry date procedure. It is a limited form of amnesty for all aliens who can show their good moral character and contin-

uous residence in the United States since 1948. That is current law. I proposed in the previous congressional debate on immigration reform and in fact my legislation was adopted by the Committee on the Judiciary in what was then known as section 301 of the bill, but to be superseded by blanket amnesty in section 302. So the trigger eliminated the adoption by the committee. But at least it was a recognition on the committee's part that this was an alternative, that if amnesty were stricken, the registry update or upgrade, as I had proposed, to 1978 in the previous Congress, would take effect. Registry date was established in 1929 when the lawful permanent admission date was 1921. It has been moved forward several times. The last time was in 1965.

In the 97th Congress, as I said, I proposed that that registry date be moved from its current law, its 1948 limitation, and upgraded or progressed to 1973.

Subsequently during the House Judiciary markup, the amendment was proposed to strike the general amnesty provisions and substitute it for the language of my bill. Mr. KINDNESS, the gentleman from Ohio, has since in this debate introduced a registry provision which I trust that the committee will consider as an alternative. Because of the continuing debate over amnesty, that amendment was withdrawn and the registry amendment alone was adopted without dissent in the committee a year ago.

Mr. MCCOLLUM, the gentleman from Florida, then offered that amendment on the floor and subsequent amendments, particularly with respect to the question of amnesty and, indeed, while we were not successful in the last debate on striking the amnesty provision, the registry date idea still has, I think, a lot of merit. It is a way to take the pressure off the system, acknowledge those folks that are here, upgrade that date, and I think we can solve a lot of problems with that particular provision.

I just have one other point that I would like to make, if the gentleman continues to have the time, and I would like to talk for just a minute about some other options besides registry.

If this House would decide, as it works its will on immigration, that we are going to keep some form of amnesty or legalization, I would hope that that date would be something like 1980 or 1981. It has a lot to do with the numbers, it has a lot to do with whether or not we send that signal to folks still wanting to come in that they can come in anyway. But I am willing to engage in some compromise that I think might be realistic.

One of the things that we can consider would be the limitation on who

would be eligible for sponsorship under the permanent laws of immigration, under the legal quota system once that person who came in with unclean hands, in violation of all principles of equity and fairness, came here illegally, but was deemed now to be a permanent resident to have legal status and now 5 years later, or 3 years later, by virtue of marrying one already here, becomes a permanent citizen, is then eligible to sponsor. We can say you can only sponsor the unmarried brother or sister. That would be a form of checking the hemorrhage from the outyear numbers that would be legalized or able to seek legal entry to the country, or we could do something like indicating, whether it is a debate between the nuclear family and extended family, we can argue that times have changed and it is not like the Italians who immigrated or the English immigrating, where we were trying to keep the whole family together, we can argue that the economic consequences are too dire.

So we could say, "On the date that you were legalized and raised your hands and we wiped the slate clean because you are here, just because you are here, that you have to list on a piece of paper that would be kept in your immigration file all the names of your relatives subject to immigration under legal terms." So mothers, brothers, sisters, fathers, spouses, and offspring thereof, children of these combinations, you would have to list all their names and addresses so that on that date 5 years later when you become a citizen and seek to legally sponsor those people to come into the country you could not have the midnight divorce and marriage and all of the adoption and paperwork committed by perjury and fraud, manufactured say, "Well, now I have a brother that I did not have when I illegally entered the United States. Now I have a sister who has since married, and they have five children," but those five children are not in the family registry or the family history or birth records of that country; but someone procured documentary evidence to support the petition filed for the legal immigration of all of those relatives. So you could do some things to at least eliminate the chance for fraud and abuse and further doctoring of records for illegal entry to the country.

That would help to guard against the abuse of entry that I think many of us are concerned about as a consequence of blanket amnesty. We have to be fair to our poor and to our budgeting problems and to those we need to get a helping hand extended to that are here now. I guess the sum and substance of it is, I say to my distinguished friend, that there are a lot of people in this country who feel that amnesty in blanket terms without some rule attached to it, carte

blanche, cheapens or devalues or shrinks, somehow just erodes the value of American citizenship.

I mean what citizenship really ought to be and what it means.

To that extent, I think we have to understand those very strong feelings out there in the country and figure out some ways to manage to do this in a much more sensible and fair way. Fair, I say, as well literally to those hundreds of thousands of people who stood in line for 8, 10, 20 years, waiting to immigrate to this country legally. And now what a slap in the face to say, "Well, if you had cheated, if you had committed some illegal act and secretly gotten yourself inside the borders of the United States of America, you would be far better off than having waited outside, continuing to persist and come legally to this great melting pot, this great country of ours."

So I want to urge my colleagues and those who may be interested in the subject to really study carefully the consequences of amnesty and, on the other side of it, to recognize that I am looking for ways to support a bill that will get our borders under control, and swift, tough, expensive employer sanctions, in my judgment, coupled with a beefing up or a substantial increase in our INS enforcement actions will be two of those measures, with the guarding of our outyear numbers, and isolating that chain migration problem from the issue of amnesty, those can be the three things that we can do in immigration reform to find a middle ground here in Congress, to pass a bill and get it to conference.

So I want to commend the gentleman for his bright and careful draftsmanship, for his concern for the difficulties that we do face in our country as a result of the serious problem of undocumented workers in our country. I indicate to the gentleman that I, as one Member, will do all that I can to cooperate and to seek a solution that the gentleman is trying to perfect in his legislation.

I thank the gentleman for taking out this time to better inform our membership on what will be an important debate here in this 99th Congress.

At this point I submit the following article:

[From The Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 9, 1985]

AMNESTY: EMOTIONAL ISSUE IN IMMIGRATION DEBATE ON CAPITOL HILL—REAGAN, HILL LEADERS CALL IT A FAIR AND NECESSARY STEP

(By John Dillin)

WASHINGTON.—Should undocumented aliens in the United States be granted "amnesty"? Should millions of aliens be given American citizenship, even though they have slipped into the U.S. illegally?

The American public doesn't like the idea. In a series of polls spanning 1977-84, Gallup found that a consistent 52 to 55 percent of

the voters opposed amnesty. About 38 percent favored it.

Even so, President Reagan and many leading members of Congress have insisted that amnesty is the fairest, most expeditious way to resolve the mounting crisis along the US border with Mexico.

This fall on Capitol Hill, two major immigration reform measures—the Simpson bill in the Senate and the Rodino-Mazzoli bill in the House—will tackle this issue. Both call for amnesty.

The bills have put Congress on a collision course with public sentiment, and this could help to spark one of the most emotional fights in the immigration debate now warming up on Capitol Hill.

Critics of amnesty, such as Rep. Hal Daub (R) of Nebraska, make these points:

Amnesty rewards law-breakers. Why should illegal aliens become citizens when millions of legal aliens are waiting their turn to enter the US?

Amnesty could be costly. Public expenses for education, welfare, and other needs could soar. Who will pay?

Amnesty sends the wrong signal. If the US grants amnesty once, it might do it again. Other people will be encouraged to sneak across the border.

Amnesty could set off a US population explosion. There may be 6-to-12 million illegal aliens today in the US. Once they are citizens, they could legally bring in millions of their relatives.

Amnesty could lead to resource problems in the Southwest. Most new immigrants would be expected to settle in California and other Western states. Water shortages could result.

Amnesty takes pressure off other nations to solve their problems. Mexico for example; has severe population problems. As long as Mexico can use the US as a "safety valve," there is little pressure to hold down its population growth.

Amnesty could damage the US economy. The US is moving toward high technology—"computerization and robotization," in Mr. Daub's words. Absorbing large numbers of unskilled workers from abroad would require the US to develop a different type of economy.

But amnesty has its defenders.

Sen. Alan K. Simpson (R) of Wyoming says if the US doesn't permit amnesty, a massive roundup of millions of people would be required, with forceful deportation. Many of those who would be deported have lived here for years, have jobs, and have children who were born in the US. Senator Simpson says he couldn't support their deportation.

Some economists, such as Julian Simon, also argue that illegal aliens have made a positive contribution to the US. They harvest many of the crops, work in restaurants, clean hotels, assemble computers, and make many other contributions to the US.

Without low-cost, hard-working alien labor, some US industries, such as clothing, would have a difficult time surviving some economists contend.

Rep. Bill Richardson (D) of New Mexico defends amnesty as "a practical decision that is consistent with effective law enforcement. The failure to include [an amnesty] program would aggravate conditions."

Even advocates of amnesty, however differ on some points. Senator Simpson's original bill this year called for amnesty only after the US had regained control of its borders. That was later changed to permit amnesty after no more than three

years. The Rodino-Mazzoli bill call for amnesty concurrent with the imposition of employer sanctions. The sanctions would make it unlawful for businesses to hire illegal aliens.

Another key difference: the Rodino-Mazzoli bill grants amnesty to aliens who were in the US before Jan. 1, 1982. The Simpson bill gives amnesty only to those who were here before Jan. 1, 1980.

That small difference makes a huge difference in numbers. The Senate bill, according to an estimate by the Congressional Budget Office, applies to only 17 percent of aliens now in the US. The House bill would apply to 40 percent.

Obviously, not every eligible alien would apply for citizenship. Some have strong ties to their homelands. Some would not be able to pass the required English-language or US history tests.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that about 60 percent of those eligible would eventually pledge allegiance to the red, white, and blue.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska, my friend, I really appreciate his leadership. I know before I got to this body he had been a leader on this issue. His comments certainly added a great deal to the debate. I very much appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have sat listening to the gentleman's special order, and I want to congratulate both he and the gentleman from Nebraska, because I think it is one of the most important parts of this special order, the fact that he is dealing on a subject matter and showing that it is multifaceted in nature. I think many people, when they think about the illegal alien problem, think about it in a one-dimensional sense, that we have got a problem with the illegals coming across the border and we have got to do something to simply put a wall in the way of that. But they do not deal with it from the standpoint of all of the various sociological problems connected with it, the economic problems connected with it, the implications for a large segment of our society and a large number of institutions in our society, what illegal immigration means to all of those things.

I think the gentleman in some of the material that he has quoted here today made that point.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DAUB] also, in dwelling on some of the questions that relate to amnesty and how broadly based that becomes, I think it is important, I think it will help Americans focus on the fact that we are not dealing with a one-dimensional problem, we are dealing with a multifaceted problem.

It also helps, I think, our colleagues in beginning to understand that this is not a subject matter that can be ignored, it is not a subject matter that for political or economic reasons or whatever can be shoved off to the side

and ignored. It is so deeply ingrained in so many aspects of our life today that we need to come up with solutions.

So I congratulate the gentleman for the special order, but I also congratulate he and the other Members of Congress who have worked so hard to try to develop solutions to the problem, because that is what Congress literally has to begin doing. We have to deal with a solution to this problem or the very nature of its broad base will overwhelm us.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. DAUB. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me say that one of the real complicated problems we face in this search for a solution is federally taking action that would impose massive financial burdens on our States, particularly in the area South, what I call the soft underbelly of our country, because, generally speaking, our migration tends to come from warmer climates to seek warmer climates here. So that puts Florida, Texas, and California under immense stress.

So if we mandate indeed certain things and then fail to pay for them at the Federal level which, if we do not guard in those outyear numbers, we will literally be legislating billions and billions of dollars in Federal costs and that will indeed bring those same kind of costs on to our States. While avoiding paying the responsibility for paying for them, it will create real, I think, tearing in the Federal-State relationship over an issue that could be handled, in my opinion, more sensibly than it appears the Congress is heading now.

□ 1540

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DAUB] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for their input.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us, as Members of Congress, certainly deal on a day-to-day basis with cases of people who are trying to emigrate, immigrate into this country legally. I guess when we embrace the concept of blanket amnesty, what do we say to those people? What do we say to someone who for years and years petitions, waits, in many cases with severe hardship to legally come into the United States of America, to pass that Statue of Liberty, and to get that lump in the throat and feel so good about coming here legally, what do we say to them when this Congress is prepared to accept—there are many people in this Congress who are prepared to accept blanket amnesty for the lawbreakers.

In 1977, when President Jimmy Carter proposed amnesty, then-Senator Richard Schweiker from Pennsyl-

vania made the statement, and I think it is a great statement, and it sums it up very nicely: "Amnesty puts the Government squarely behind the lawbreaker."

What you in effect say to the lawbreaker is, "Congratulations. You have successfully violated our laws and avoided detection. Here is your reward." That is exactly, ladies and gentleman, what is happening. That is exactly what we do with blanket amnesty. We ignore, as anybody who has talked about amnesty; has anybody talked about giving amnesty to those people who have been waiting for 7 or 8 years to get in here legally? How about amnesty for those people? How about saying, Let everybody who has been waiting come in? I have not heard that.

We are working strictly on those who are illegal aliens in this country, and it is wrong, and the American people know it is wrong, and that is why this Congress was unable to pass legislation last year in the 98th Congress, because it had the amnesty provision in it. Otherwise, legislation would have come out of this body.

On the subject of amnesty, again, Thursday, December 31, 1984, the Christian Science Monitor: "Blanket Amnesty: Contrary to U.S. Interests." Of course it is contrary to U.S. interests.

... amnesty encourages the prospect of repeated amnesties. As a result, it would encourage additional illegal immigration of low-skilled workers; indeed, illegal immigration increased sharply after President Carter first proposed amnesty in 1977.

Second, perhaps several million family members of the illegal aliens given amnesty might seek to migrate to the US.

A third consideration is that with amnesty, many of the adult male illegal aliens now in the United States would be less inclined to return to their home countries ...

Quoting again from the Christian Science Monitor:

Granting amnesty is discriminatory. It discriminates against other deserving people who wish to migrate to the US but do not do so illegally because they view it as either distasteful or too costly.

"Public policy"—and we do set public policy here—quote from the Christian Science Monitor:

Public policy should not reward those who begin their lives in the United States by violating its laws!

In conclusion, this bill, H.R. 2267, is an attempt; I believe an honest attempt, I believe it is an attempt to bring some people together in this body to get legislation that will deal with this tremendous problem that we face in the United States of America.

I invite my colleagues to look over H.R. 2267, respond to the mail that I know is coming into their offices because I have heard about it coming in, and take a good look at the bill; examine your conscience; think about the

amount of dollars that we vote for everything that comes down the pike to solve every problem we can think of in this country. Many of those problems that we are throwing money at are the result of our illegal aliens and the result of the lack of enforcement and the lack of giving dollars to the appropriate people in the INS.

One INS agent made the statement that working as a border patrolman was like serving in Vietnam. Now, that is a sad commentary on the people who are trying to protect our borders, when they feel it is almost like combat pay. We should be giving them all the help they need. Every dollar we spend in enforcing and beefing up the border patrol will be millions returned, believe me.

THE 1985 FARM LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I take the time today to visit briefly with my colleagues about the farm legislation which we will begin debate on tomorrow, Friday, September 20, 1985. Actually, we began the process when the 1981 act was enacted; the revision process began then, 4 years ago.

In earnest, last year we started hearings throughout this Nation to listen to farmers, to a whole spectrum of agriculture. For the first time, we brought in implement dealers, fertilizer dealers, seed dealers, bankers; everyone involved in rural America with the farmer, with the producer, with the rancher, and we had testimony from them, counsel, advice.

We, either myself personally as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, or subcommittee chairmen and/or other Members had hearings in 45 of the 50 States; we went from California to Vermont, from Florida to North Dakota, to Texas, to Colorado, Wyoming, downtown New York City, upstate New York, and we made a diligent effort to document what the problems were and what area we should address in this legislation.

No one can say, I can attest, that they were not heard or they were not given the opportunity to present their views.

Then, after that was done, our respective subcommittees began the process here in Washington continuing hearings; and once that was done, then they began what we call markup, they began writing the bill, or their jurisdictional part of the bill.

Mr. HUCKABY. Will the chairman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. HUCKABY. I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] for

yielding. I would like to take this moment to commend the gentleman from Texas. I can remember perhaps over a year and a half ago, when the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture began suggesting and pushing: "Let's get out, let's start having field hearings." The chairman was most perceptive in seeing the rapid pitfall that agriculture was doing, to give everyone the opportunity to participate and have input into this.

I have sat in meetings, literally for hundreds of hours that the chairman has conducted, so that this input could be obtained, and then the development of the farm bill.

I would also like to commend the chairman for the manner in which he conducted and allowed the subcommittees to do their own thing, working with the various leaders, the various farmers, et cetera, in Agriculture and the various commodities as such, and then the excellent job that you have done in molding this product together and bringing it to the floor of the House, and the real political courage of getting out front before the other body.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

□ 1550

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and I thank him for his contribution as the distinguished chairman of the Cotton, Sugar, and Rice Subcommittee, three major commodities. That will be part of the overall omnibus bill that we will begin with in what we call general debate, the discussion, tomorrow.

But let me continue by saying that then the subcommittees did the drafting of the cotton version, the sugar, the rice, the soybeans, the wheat, the feed grain, conservation, credit—19 sections to the bill.

I introduced H.R. 2100 to be the vehicle, and I say very humbly and honestly that no intent was had at all that it has my name. My name is incidental only as author. What we attempted to provide with this H.R. 2100 that will be the vehicle that we begin discussion on tomorrow was that I would provide the engine and the caboose with flatcars, and then each subcommittee then would piggyback their version onto the flatcar, and eventually we would have a train engine, caboose, and 19 flatcars that would have from the subcommittees what they had drafted or crafted themselves, with the hearings, with the input from everyone concerned, and make that the vehicle that would come to the floor.

I would submit to my colleagues that it has been a very difficult process, it has been long, many hours have been taken and devoted by members of the committee, the subcommittee, the subcommittee chairmen, myself, staff of the committee and the various subcommittees.

I would, very briefly, like to enumerate the sections which I will incorporate into the RECORD.

Title I will be sugar, which, basically, extends the program that we now have until 1990.

Title II would be dairy. And this is an area that is very important because we have had added inventory, or surplus, if you would call it, in that area, and it has a combination of diversion, of buyout protection. One of the interesting areas, I think my colleagues would be interested in knowing, I liken somewhat to a juggler. You see a juggler juggling, but I have never noticed, and I am sure most of us have not noticed, he always juggles the same item, the duckpin, plate, or ball, but always they are the same size, same weight, and all he has to provide then is the rhythm. Once he starts the rhythm, it is the same item, same size ball, same configuration, same everything. Well, in trying to pass a farm bill and adding all of the provisions, we do not have that luxury. We have to juggle a bale of cotton, a can of milk, a bushel of wheat, everything different. But we have to keep them in the air and balance so one will not do damage to the other. This is one of the areas that I would like to mention in the dairy section. In attempting to reduce the overage in the dairy, you cull some cows or you buy out a whole herd, but if you put that into the red-meat market, then you do damage to the producers of the red-meat industry.

So we have to be very conscious and we have to dedicate our best efforts to see that we have a balance, that in helping one you do not do damage to the other one over here on the other side. I think we have done that fairly well in the dairy section. We create a national dairy research endowment institute, to be funded by revenues raised from milk producers, and we bring in the importers for the first time so they participate. We have differentials for areas, different regions, of the country, and we extend the authority to transfer dairy products to the military for 5 years. So that would be the second section.

Then the third section would be wool and mohair. This is a national strategic item. Many people really do not know that we have a major wool industry, getting wool from sheep. Mohair, for those who may be from urban areas, comes from goats. That is a strategic material that we provide support so that we might have in time of need.

Then we have title IV. That is wheat. It establishes a program for the 1986 through 1990 years, extending and modifying provisions for target price.

I want to be very elementary and I want to see that everyone understands, not only our colleagues, but

their constituents, exactly what we are doing with that legislation and what it does.

You might hear loan rate and target price. Well, what does that mean? Well, target price is, basically, arbitrary, but you take some averages for 3 years back, and the target price is what we decide, the Congress decides, the item should sell for. And then you have loan rate. Loan rate is a provision for credit to the producer, that you give him assistance either before or after, depending on which road you take, the crop is harvested. But, basically, it guarantees him the opportunity that, if he cannot sell his crop, he can leave it in the loan, forfeit it, basically, and get from the Government that amount of loan per pound or per bushel, or whatever the crop might be. And that is done by the CCC, the Commodity Credit Corporation. This is a semi-, quasi-governmental agency that sits off on the side to regulate all of this and is the one that the loan is forfeited to.

Target price. I am just using arbitrary figures, not what would be the actual figure. But let us say that the cotton target price would be 85 cents. The farmer then sold it for 80 cents. So that means that the Government would make up the 5 cents that he sold below the target price. That would be taxpayers' money, that would be your funds, that would be taxpayers' money. Later I will go into why and the need for it.

So, basically, section 4 would be wheat.

Section 5 would be feedgrains. That is corn and milo sorghum and the other grains that we deal with. Again, this modifies provision for target price protection. And I might add that it freezes for 2 years the target price.

Title V(A) would be a producer-approved referendum. This has stirred some controversy, but it is a very simple process, that the Secretary of Agriculture would referendum, would ask producers, farmers, if they would like to have this program, and they would vote, anyone who has over 15 acres would then have the opportunity to vote, "Yes, we want it," or, "No, we do not want it." If they say "No," then he has this backup, what I just explained in title V. This referendum, then, the farmers, producers themselves, for wheat and the feedgrains, which is basically corn and sorghum, would make the decision, and this would provide for domestic and foreign provisions so that you would have certificates, what would be the domestic part of the product that he would have a certificate and could get the Government guarantee or the Government loan. The rest, then, would go into export, and there would be a provision to see that we can compete with the rest of the world that produces this commodity. Later, I will also men-

tion in the trade section one of the problems there.

Title VI would be cotton, and it basically carries forward the provisions of the present act.

Title VII would be rice. Again we have a little problem with rice. Many of the countries of the world that were not producing rice are now producing. Some that were producing are now producing sufficiently to export and are competing with us in the exports in that their price is below our price, and we have a difficult situation in that respect. So we are trying to bolster or sustain as best we can the American production and make it compatible with the other nations in the world that produce and export.

Title VIII would be peanuts. We basically extend the present program.

Title IX would be soybeans, and the existing soybean price program would be continued, with one change. This change provides the Secretary of Agriculture with additional authority whereby he can reduce the level of the 1986 soybean loan, that loan I mentioned that they can forfeit into the Government, by up to 5 percent if he so determines.

Title X would be general commodity provisions, which covers commodities and technical means.

Title XI would be trade. And this extends Public Law 480. This is the law whereby it would take from that quasi-Government institution, the Commodity Credit Corporation, for donations to other countries, to needy countries, and/or to sell at lower interest rates to developing countries. This section now raises authorization for Public Law 480 so we can assist more countries and participate in exporting more of our commodities. It directs the Secretary of Agriculture to direct a payment-in-kind export assistance program to encourage expansion of our domestic farm productivity. It broadens authority for intermediate-term export loans, and it provides for Government guarantees of at least \$5 billion in commercial short-term export credits.

This is a very good program. An exporter or an individual finds a customer in another country. The other customer then has to secure his commercial financing for the commodity, but under this provision our Government would guarantee to the bank an x percentage of that loan, so he is committed to pay for the loan, but then should something go wrong, we would pick up that loan. It is rarely done. It is a very good program.

Title XII would be credit. One of my colleagues mentioned earlier the farm credit system. That is another issue. I will mention that again later. But what we deal with now is basically Farmers Home Administration, an entity of the Department of Agriculture, and that is the one that makes

operating loans or available loans to purchase land or refinance, and that would be title XIII of our bill.

Title XIV would be the national agricultural research extension and teaching policy. This is where we extend that for 5 years. We have several formulae by which we provide assistance to land grant institutions for research, for extension purposes, and we continue that very, very, very good program.

Title XV is food stamp and related issues. The Food Stamp Program or assistance to those in need are handled through our committee and are a basic part of the Department of Agriculture. We authorize the program or reauthorize for 5 years.

Title XVI is amendments to the temporary emergency food assistance, and we extend for 2 years.

Title XVII is nutrition programs. We expand the consumer education services for low-income families, and we work with low-income families in nutrition programs to see that those who avail themselves or are in need of that program utilize it to the utmost.

□ 1605

We have in my area in south Texas, we have a beautiful program that a young lady who is in charge of that program has gone into the neighborhoods and has selected a volunteer who is then trained to work with the rest of the neighborhood in what is a nutritious meal. What can you prepare for the lowest amount of money for the most nutrition. How can you feed your family. What are the items required in the diet. You should not give a 2-year-old child the same meal that you give your 40-year-old husband. They deal beautifully. This program has worked. Where properly utilized, and I would hope that it would be thus, it is a very good program.

Title XVIII are miscellaneous provisions. For example, additional standards for processing of eggs; revises and strengthens the Beef Research and Information Act; it established a promotion, research, and consumer information for pork and pork producers. These two are basically to assist the industry in promoting the products. Again, we have a problem in the balancing act I was mentioning.

We have beef producers, a rancher out there or a feedlot. They hire x number of people, and they have to sell their products to stay in business. They are doing fairly well. Some others not as well. But then you have coming from the other side, either in imports or then the health situation saying you should not eat beef or you should not eat this or that because of a health problem or possible health problem. I am not going to start an argument. I do not intend to start an argument. I do not challenge the ex-

perts. I do not challenge the medical profession. My wife and I have son who is a doctor, so I am not attempting to do that.

I have taken the attitude as chairman of the Agriculture Committee that we want to sell every one of our products that we can and the only caveat I use is that you have to use moderation. You have to use moderation. Maybe you should not eat too much of this or too much of that. I guess I am not the best example of using moderation, but that is what we have to do.

Then we have title XIX, which is the National Agricultural Policy Commission Act, that we hope would be helpful to the process. Let me go to the general aspects.

Are our farmers and producers in trouble? Yes, a great number of them are. Why are they in trouble? Are they in trouble because they are not good farmers? No, we have the best in the world. Are they in trouble because they are lazy or inefficient? No, we have the best in the world. Are they in trouble because they do not have good land? No, we have the best in the world. So then you might ask: Why are they in trouble? They are in trouble, basically, for something beyond their control. Something that has befallen them made by other events and other circumstances. Those that are in trouble are in trouble because of the high interest rates in one respect. They have to borrow money. It is very rare the farmer, rancher, or producer that has his own resources to raise the annual crop. He has to borrow for that, almost like every business. Most major manufacturing institutions program debt. They borrow; they give debentures; they sell bonds, and so does the farmer. He has to borrow either from the private sector, from the farm credit system, or from the U.S. Government. This is basically where he borrows from. When the interest escalated, many of them got in trouble and they have not been able to recoup and get back.

Another area was inflation. Now, we have got inflation fairly well under control; it is coming down some. But inflation escalated because of what the farmer uses to make their crops. The largest consumer in the United States is the agricultural sector, the farm sector, because he uses that land given to us by God, but that is only the receptacle for that seed. Beyond that, he has to buy the seed, he has to buy the fertilizer, he has to buy in most instances water to water his seed, to water the fertilized seed. Then he has to have insecticides, pesticides, rodenticides. He has to have machinery in the shop, the tractor. He has to have pickups, he has to have trucks. All of this he has to buy, and when he was buying it at inflated prices, but his

commodity prices were not keeping up with that, then he got in trouble.

In the export area, this is a very difficult thing, and it is very difficult for me and for our committee. There is trading in currency. The average American pays little attention to that. You see in the paper or here on the television or the radio that the price of the dollar as against the deutsche mark or the British pound or the Japanese yen, and you say, well, it does not affect me. Well, it does. Because as the dollar gains in strength or in value, that means the other currency came down. This is what they were using to buy our products. So let us say that 100 deutsche marks, 100 German marks bought a bale of cotton. Not the actual amount, but we will use that; it bought a bale of cotton. That was 100 as contrasted to \$100 when they were equal.

But then, when the value of the dollar went up, that \$100, now you have to have 150 deutsche marks to buy that \$100 in the currency markets, which means then that the fellow that was going to buy the bale of cotton for \$100 now has to add another \$50. If he is going to add another \$50, when he would have bought two bales of cotton, now he can only buy one, for one-half or what would have bought the second half. That reduces our sale of exports. This is not the doing of the farmer; he has nothing to do with it. It is our Government, the stability, the Federal Reserve, the other countries' stability of their currencies; Heaven knows what. But the ultimate one that suffered was our farmer. He has that problem.

Now, I have the problem, our committee has the problem; do we say, "Do not buy our dollars; they are no good." How can we say that? So we have to then have current shifts and controls and manipulations to try and see how we can undo some of the damage by that value of the dollar.

Then we have another very serious problem—that other countries in the export business subsidize. They subsidize their farmers and the export sector which makes their commodities of equal value, quality, maybe lesser quality, but more attractive because the government is subsidizing them so they can sell at a lower price. By and large we do not subsidize for exports; we have some in this legislation.

Now, an area where we are going to try and match, to put it plainly or simply, as many Members mention, that we play the world game of export in an uneven field. Unbalanced against us, so we are going uphill. All we are trying to do is to balance that field so we have an even field, and then we can compete actively.

Now, my colleagues ask: Why should we use the taxpayers' money to work with the farmer, to help the farmer or the producer? Well, that is a legiti-

mate question, but it is answered very simply.

□ 1615

The American people are the best fed people in the world in the history of the world. It does not mean that there is no hunger here or deprivation. It does not mean that. But overall, we are the best fed people in the world. I would like to mention this.

If someone does not have appropriate nutrition, it has not been the fault of the farmer; never the fault of the farmer. The food has been there, but the man does not have a job, the family does not have income, there has been a disaster of some kind, transportation, marketing, whatever, but never the fault of the farmer.

Second and very important, the American family spends the least amount of money from their income for food of any other nation in the world. The least amount of disposable income per family for food is the United States. Everything from there on escalates. We are now maybe at about 12 percent of disposable income, and going down, up to about 50 or 60 percent in other areas of the world.

Some people call it a cheap food policy. I do not like to use the term, but I do want to emphasize that all that bounty that the homemaker or the housewife has at the grocery store comes from the farmer who by and large did not get what it cost him to produce that item, and he is the one at the bottom of the totem pole. Everything that you buy at the grocery store, my colleague, the one who got the least amount for what you paid was the farmer.

You buy a loaf of bread, 86 cents, 6 cents went to the farmer. You buy a pound of beef, \$3, maybe the cow sold on the hoof at 80 or 90 cents a pound and \$1 a pound.

That is part of the problem, and that is one of the reasons that Government has and should and well ought to intervene to see that we do not have this. I want to make something very clear: that not all commodities in my area of Texas, the fruit and vegetable industry, they get no support of any kind from Government. I probably could say most of what they get from Government is harassment and intervention in their affairs, but yet they are not here asking and they are not complaining because they feel that they can do well with the system that they have now. Prices go up and down and we have problems there.

But then one final item as to why we should use Government funds, taxpayers' money, my taxes, to work with the producers and the farmers. This is my submarine story that many of my colleagues have heard.

When I was 17 years old I joined the Navy. I saw a sign that said, "Join the

Navy and see the world." I joined. They lied to me. I went to San Diego, CA, and the Great Lakes in Illinois, Camp Wallace, TX, between Houston and Galveston, the back way, a place called Hitchcock. So I never got on board a ship. I got run out of more captains' offices and lieutenants' offices. I said, "I want to go on board a ship." Well, it never happened. They kept sending me to school. I did not want to go to school. I did not join the Navy to go to school, but I kept going to school.

When I was elected to Congress, we have liaison. That is, members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and Coast Guard who are the liaison between their service and the Members of Congress. Naturally, when a new Member of Congress is elected, they come to visit him and to tell him about their service, and this is very important.

So when the Navy fellow came to see me, he said, "I hear you are an old sailor."

I said, "You bet."

He started off with, "What ship were you on?"

Well, I had to say, "Great Lakes, IL." That was my ship.

But then he said, "Anything I can do for you?"

I said, "Yes, get me on board a ship."

So he said, "When?"

I said, "Any time."

"What kind of ship?"

I said, "Shoot the works. Give me the biggest one. A carrier."

They have a program where they invite civic leaders and elected officials and Members of Congress and Boy Scouts, and so on, bring them aboard ship and give them sometimes an orientation cruise, staying overnight, and this is very interesting.

So they had one of those and I went. We went on this carrier and we had a tremendous visit, a beautiful visit. I enjoyed it so much that the next time I said, "I would like to see a cruiser." I progressed, and about 3 years ago I finally came up with the big one. "I want to go on a submarine, nuclear power, nuclear arms."

They said, "Well, you may have to take a physical exam. You might have to lose a few pounds." Those holes you go in and out of on a submarine are not too terribly big, so I had a little bit of a problem. We worked it out and off I went. We went on this submarine out in the Atlantic, nuclear power, nuclear arms. It was beautiful. The experience of a lifetime for me.

For those of you who fly, you fly a submarine just like an airplane. It has dual controls. You push down, it goes down. Pull up and it goes up. Port. Starboard. That is left and right in Navy language.

It was a great day, a beautiful experience. We are coming back, we are topside, I have seen everything, I have

done everything, and I asked the captain, because we have in the national defense, in the physical defense of our country, and indeed the world, something we call the triad. We defend our country with the troops on the ground and missiles on the ground and in underground silos. We have the airplanes overhead, and we have the submarines under the sea, undetected, that are part of the triad for national defense in case of attack, and God forbid that it should ever happen, but they are there.

So one of the most important things is how long can that submarine stay underwater undetected, so I asked him that question. He smiled at me and said, "That is a military secret." I did not want to involve myself with a military secret, but then he smiled and said, "Do you want to take a guess?"

So I said, "Sure, I will take a guess," and I was thinking of the reactor, the propellant, that nuclear core that propels the ship, because they are self-contained. In World War II and prior to that, the conventional submarines had to surface to recharge batteries, and so on, and this was very dangerous and very critical in wartime, especially in a war zone. But the nuclear-powered sub does not have to do that. So my question was, "How long can you keep that baby down there undetected?"

He said, "Guess."

So I thought, short, 2 years, long, 15 years, so I said, "7 years."

He smiled and he said, "No." He said, "You are chairman of the Ag Committee."

I said, "Yes."

He said, "Would you like to take another guess?"

I said, "No. If you are going to tell me, tell me."

He looked me straight in the eye and he smiled, and he said, "I can keep this submarine under water, undetected, as long as I have food for my crew."

That is the limitation. So who is keeping the peace for the world and the United States? The farmers of America are the ones who are keeping that submarine under water, undetected. And let me tell you that that one submarine, it was an awesome feeling to know that that submarine had enough megatonnage to destroy the world. On one submarine, enough megatonnage to destroy the world, to be a deterrent to any aggressor, to be the item that we use in discussions for reducing armament, for reducing the possibility of nuclear exchange. That submarine could be the all of what we use to deter, to negotiate, to keep the peace, and yet its major limitation was food, provided by the farmers of America.

□ 1625

Should we not then use the taxpayers' money to see that the farmer stays on the land, I ask my colleagues? Is it not worth the safety and peace for our generation, our children and our children's children, that we use some of the taxpayers' dollars?

How many of the taxpayers' dollars do we use in relation to the budget? We have a budget now that is around \$1 trillion. That is \$100 billion. Three percent of that goes to agriculture. Three percent of the total budget of the appropriated funds from your tax dollars, only 3 percent, goes to agriculture. One percent almost goes to food stamp programs. One percent goes to run the Department of Agriculture and all of the areas of agriculture: research, extension, land-grant colleges, Farmers Home, and the areas where you do not have borrowing activity but appropriated funds. And only 1 percent goes to the commodity programs that I have been discussing. So we are the best-fed people in the world, with some exceptions, we have the lowest amount of disposable income for food per family, and we are keeping that submarine guarding the peace, for 1 percent of the total budget. Certainly I would be happy if they take 1 percent of what I pay. And I think that you would, too. You see farmers out there; they are selling their land, they are selling their implements. I have seen them cry. I just had a call from a lady from Colorado, Fort Morgan, CO. She said I could use her name, Naomi Woods. "I have 3,700 acres about to be auctioned off," she said.

They are good farmers. She and her husband and the kids all worked on their farm. They are efficient. But they had to borrow when the interest rate was high. Maybe they made a bad judgment in buying additional land when the interest rate was high, but they cannot keep up the payment; they cannot sell the product they are producing. And she told me something I would like to leave with you, my colleagues, that we have to look at. Should we help Naomi Woods? I think so. Why? Because she is a nice, kind lady? No. Why? Because she is a farmer or a farmer's wife? No, not necessarily. Why? She mentioned something so humbly, so simply; she said, "Congressman, rural Colorado is dying. They have closed the sugar mill at Fort Morgan, they have closed the beef plant at Fort Morgan, they closed the grain elevator at Fort Morgan, they are closing down the main street, and we cannot all go to Denver to look for jobs because they are not there." And if they all go to Denver, food stamps, aid to dependent children, housing, medical attention, everything that we do as a government with sensitivity, with compassion for those in time of need, would cost more than

helping her keep her farm. That is the question. It is for the benefit of that taxpayer that would ultimately pay more if we let her go to Denver, because we are a compassionate people, and we are not going to let her go hungry, and we are not going to let her and her family go homeless. We are going to help. But it is going to cost more than that little help she needs to keep that farm, to keep that submarine under water protecting the peace. That is why I would want my taxpayers' money, the money I pay, to go in part to agriculture. And I think you would, too, I say to my colleagues.

The farmers of America need help. They need support. One of my colleagues asked me, "What do I ask my constituents to do?"

I told him, "Very simply, you have your constituents contact their Congressman. Have them write him. Support the farmers of America."

That is what I hope he tells his constituents right now, this week: "Write your Congressman. Tell him. Support the farmers of America, support the people who are keeping that submarine there protecting the peace for us. Support those who are providing the food for our troops in Europe and Korea and every corner of the world. Support the people who are giving us that food for the lowest amount of disposable income."

That is what I told my colleague. I said, "You tell your friends, you tell your constituents, you tell anyone that will listen to you. Write, call, or contact your Member of Congress. He should know of your interest."

That is what I told my colleague to tell his constituents. This is what I tell my constituents.

I know that every farmer is not in trouble. Every farmer is not going broke. Yet it could be traumatic if those who are in trouble were to go under. It is not as simple as saying, "Well, if the Woods go, the Browns will come in. Interest rates will be lower, and they can replace them and they can continue." It does not work that way, because my colleagues might remember that I sent a chart in an article from one of the local newspapers that showed it in scale. In the graph the price of what the farmer pays for commodities went up, up, up, and then there was a little decline. The price of what the farmer paid for what he uses in farming, insecticides, pesticides, seed, fertilizer, et cetera, goes up, up, up on the graph, and then slightly down. And then the last part of the graph shows the income the farm gets. It goes along on a level, and then it goes down, down, down.

That is the graphic situation. That is what is happening, and that is why all of us need to get together.

There are some areas of the farm bill I might mention—sugar, for example. We are a deficit nation in sugar.

We do not produce all the sugar we consume in this country, so some wise people a few years back started a program that we import basically about 50 percent of the sugar that we consume in this country. So they put a little tariff or a fee on that sugar that comes in from another country. It guarantees a price, a level, higher than the world price. There is a floating level in the world price that is sometimes as low as 4 or 5 cents, but that is not what we would buy the sugar for. We helped developing countries, we helped our friends who ship us the sugar by giving them a good price. Then we said, "Hey, for the sake of that good price, for that protection you get for selling into our market, which is a lucrative market, why don't you give us back about 2 or 3 cents?"

Well, we take that 2 or 3 cents, and that is what we use to provide support to the producer of sugar, and we do not use our taxpayers' money. It is a good program. It has worked well. We have not utilized taxpayer money but very rarely in the past few years, because we get it from the people we give the privilege to, to sell us sugar at better prices than they would get if they would go into the open market or the world market, and we recoup that money.

I have heard some of my colleagues over here from the shoe caucus tell us about the shoe industry being in trouble. Over here the steel caucus says the steel industry is in trouble. Over here they talk about textiles. The textile industry is in trouble. One of our subcommittees passed a bill out of subcommittee today dealing with the textile issue.

Then we have bricks, and then we have concrete, and we have automobiles. Almost all of America is in trouble. But these farsighted individuals long ago addressed the issue of sugar, and I would hope none of my colleagues would oppose that program. I know some will, and it is sad really that anybody would be trying to undo that program. It is not costing the taxpayer any money.

They say, "Well, you are raising the price of sugar to the American consumer." But he still gets all his basket of food at the grocery store for less money than any other people in the world, and sugar is a small item in his diet.

I would hope that my colleagues would listen and take heed of that with some degree of compassion and then in an intelligent way look to see that we have done what they are asking us now to do for shoes, for textiles, for steel, for cars, and for all the other items we have manufactured.

I say this with sadness in my heart: The world is not buying what we manufacture in the United States of America. We are not the greatest manufacturing country in the world anymore.

What they are buying from us is what we produce in agriculture, and even that is coming down. That is the only thing that is bringing money back.

We read in the paper, we hear, and we discuss it here, about the tremendous balance of payments, that more dollars are going out than are coming in. The only dollars coming in—and this is hard to acknowledge—are from agriculture. And in the area where we are deficient, in sugar, I cannot imagine that any Member would even remotely think to undo a program that has worked so well and that has helped the American consumer. We should have pride in that we have at least some producers who are willing to continue at risk to produce cane or sugar beet for sugar in this market. And now we have sugar through this high fructose with corn liquid sweeteners.

So I say to my friends that I would hope my colleagues who are listening to me and who will read this in the Record will study this issue, and hopefully they will agree with me. Again I repeat that I hope every one of my colleagues tells his constituents, "Write me or write your Congressman and tell him to help the farmer of America. Help those who are helping us be healthy, be a proud nation, be a great nation, and be a strong nation in spite of adversity."

Even if everything were perfect, farmers still have to fight Nature, drought, flood, insects, pests. Even with everything being perfect, the farmer has the deck stacked against him.

"Why does he stay?" someone asked me. "Why does he stay year after year?"

"Well," I replied, "I come from south Texas, and in our area of south Texas we have a saying: 'If you don't feel the vibration when you go on the land, forget it, it isn't going to grow for you.'"

That is what the farmer is all about. If you do not feel the vibration when you go on the land, you are not a farmer, you are not a rancher, and it is not going to work.

That is why they hang in there, hoping against hope. Farmers are proud. They do not want sympathy. They do not go around begging. The last thing they want is to have the Government intervene, but there comes a time when need arises and they have to ask, and we have to give.

The good Lord made us, in my belief, to His image and His likeness. Why did He make the human body require food or water? Only God can give us water. Only the farmer can give us food.

So, Mr. Speaker, I guess the good Lord made the body to His image and His likeness needing food because he wanted farmers on the land. That is why.

Mr. Speaker, the major provisions of the Food Security Act of 1985 are briefly described below.

TITLE I—SUGAR

The bill extends, through the 1990 crop, the price support loan program for sugar beets and sugarcane.

TITLE II—DAIRY

The Dairy Unity Act of 1985—

(1) For the fiscal years 1986 through 1990—

(A) establishes price supports for milk under a formula that ties the support level to changes in the real cost of producing milk and adjusts the initial support level for each year to reflect changes in commercial demand for milk;

(B) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to adopt a milk supply-reduction program if projected surpluses exceed trigger levels, and requires him to do so if the projected surpluses exceed a higher trigger;

(C) provides for payments to dairy farmers who agree to reduce their production under the program;

(D) requires a reduction in the price of milk when a diversion program is in effect to cover costs of the program that exceed the costs to the Government of 5 billion pounds of milk; and

(E) directs the Secretary, when a milk diversion program is in effect, to purchase and distribute an additional 200 million pounds of red meat annually.

(2) Directs the Secretary to study whether casein imports interfere with the milk price support program.

(3) Creates a National Dairy Research Endowment Institute to be funded by revenues raised from milk producers and dairy product importers.

(4) Requires the Secretary to increase differentials in a number of specified milk marketing orders.

(5) Establishes a National Commission on Dairy Policy to study and make recommendations on the operation of the Federal milk price support program.

(6) Extends for five years (A) authority to transfer dairy products to the military and veterans hospitals, and (B) the dairy indemnity program.

TITLE III—WOOL AND MOHAIR

The bill extends for five years the present program of payments to producers of wool and mohair.

TITLE IV—WHEAT

The bill establishes a program for the 1986 through 1990 crops of wheat that would—

(1) extend and modify provisions for target price protection for producers; (targets would be frozen for two years and, after that, could be reduced only if farm costs come down);

(2) make available a price support loan program that is responsive to market prices; and

(3) establish acreage reduction programs that must be implemented if surplus stocks are large.

TITLE V—FEED GRAINS

The bill establishes a program for the 1986 through 1990 crops of feed grains that would—

(1) extend and modify provisions for target price protection for producers; (targets would be frozen for two years and, after that, could be only if farm costs come down);

(2) make available a price support loan program that is responsive to market prices; and

(3) establish acreage reduction programs that must be implemented if surplus stocks are large.

TITLE VA—PRODUCER-APPROVED WHEAT AND FEED GRAINS PROGRAMS

The bill includes a program under which wheat and feed grain producers would have the opportunity, through referendum, to adopt a program under which cooperators under the voluntary program would obtain price support loans and marketing certificates. The program would provide for export subsidies to keep grain competitive in world markets, and producers who elect not to participate (and, thus, do not receive marketing certificates) would be required either to feed their grain on their farms or export it at world market prices.

TITLE VI—COTTON

The bill establishes a program for the 1986 through 1990 crops of feed grains that would—

(1) extend and modify provisions for target price protection for producers (targets would be frozen for two years and, after that, could be reduced only if farm costs come down);

(2) make available a price support loan program that is responsive to market prices;

(3) establish acreage reduction programs that must be implemented if surplus stocks are large; and

(4) direct the Secretary of Agriculture to issue marketing certificates to handlers when the world market price falls below the loan rate.

TITLE VII—RICE

The bill establishes a program for the 1986 through 1990 crops of rice that would—

(1) extend and modify provisions for target price protection for producers (targets would be frozen for two years and, after that, could be reduced only if farm costs come down);

(2) make available a price support loan program that is responsive to market prices;

(3) establish acreage reduction programs that must be implemented if surplus stocks are large; and

(4) direct the Secretary of Agriculture to issue marketing certificates to exporters when the world market price falls below the loan rate.

TITLE VIII—PEANUTS

The bill generally continues, through the 1990 crop, the price support and marketing quota program that has been in effect since 1981, but makes certain modifications to reflect changed circumstances. Price supports would be linked to production costs, and any added domestic quota acreage would be shared by new growers.

TITLE IX—SOYBEANS

The bill extends, through the 1990 crop, the existing soybean price support program, with one change. This change provides the Secretary of Agriculture with additional authority whereby he can reduce the level of the 1986 soybean loan by up to 5 percent if he determines that the initial rate would not make the crop competitive on world markets. No target price or acreage control authorities will be authorized.

TITLE X—GENERAL COMMODITY PROVISIONS

The Agricultural Efficiency and Equity Act of 1985 adopts a revised system, to be reflected in permanent law, for establishing

farm and commodity acreage bases and program yields for wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, and rice.

The bill also—

(1) establishes (unchanged from existing law) a \$50,000 annual payment limitation under the wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, extra long staple cotton, and rice programs;

(2) establishes a \$100,000 annual limitation on disaster payments under the wheat and feed grains programs;

(3) establishes a \$250,000 annual limitation on the total amount of nonrecourse loans that a person may receive under the 1986 through 1990 crops of wheat, feed grains, soybeans, peanuts and tobacco;

(4) permits producers of wheat, feed grains, upland cotton or rice to devote any part of diverted acreage to haying and grazing during eight months of the year;

(5) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to provide a supplemental set-aside and acreage limitation program for wheat and feed grains if such action is in the public interest because of the imposition of export restrictions;

(6) authorizes the Secretary to enter into the multiyear set-aside contracts with producers of wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, and rice;

(7) authorizes the Secretary, in order to reduce the costs of a commodity program, to—

(a) purchase, on the commercial market, a commodity for which a nonrecourse loan program is in effect;

(b) settle the loan for less than the total of the principal and interest when the domestic price of a commodity will not cover the principal and accumulated interest on the loan; and

(c) reopen a production control or loan program for a major commodity for the purpose of accepting bids from producers for conversion of acreage planted to the crop to diverted acres in return for payments in kind from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks;

(8) modifies the provisions of permanent law relating to the producer reserve program for wheat and feed grains;

(9) authorizes the Secretary to make advance deficiency payments to producers if an acreage limitation or set-aside program is in effect for wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, and rice, and if deficiency payments will probably be made;

(10) authorizes the Secretary to establish an export certificate program for wheat or feed grains;

(11) requires the Secretary to dispose of certain surplus Government-owned stocks for purposes of emergency domestic food assistance and emergency humanitarian food needs abroad;

(12) authorizes the Secretary to make advance recourse commodity loans to producers; and

(13) authorizes the use of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, at no cost or reduced cost, to encourage the purchase of such commodities for the production of liquid fuel.

TITLE XI—TRADE

The bill—

(1) extends authorities under Public Law 480 for five years;

(2) raises the authorization for the Title II program under Public Law 480 to \$1.2 billion annually;

(3) directs the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a payment-in-kind export assistant

program to encourage expansion of farm exports;

(4) directs the Secretary, in coordination with the Special Trade Representative, to seek multilateral consultations to reduce the need for export subsidies and the likelihood of a trade war;

(5) provides for Government guarantees for at least \$5 billion in commercial short-term export credits in fiscal year 1986, plus at least \$325 million in direct export loans, for use in blended credit transactions;

(6) exempts blended credit and other commercial-type export sales from cargo preference provisions; and

(7) broadens authority for intermediate-term export loans and extends for five years authority for an export credit revolving fund.

TITLE XII—RESOURCE CONSERVATION

The bill—

(1) provides, with various exceptions, that persons who produce agricultural commodities on highly erodible land or converted wetlands will be ineligible for benefits under various Federal programs;

(2) establishes a conservation reserve program under which up to 25 million acres of highly erodible cropland may be converted from payments and Federal sharing in the cost of conservation measures;

(3) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to provide technical assistance to protect the quantity and quality of subsurface water; and

(4) extends the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977 through the year 2008.

TITLE XIII—CREDIT

The bill—

(1) includes joint operations among entities that may receive Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) farm ownership, operating, and disaster loans;

(2) modifies the program for FmHA water and waste disposal programs for smaller and poorer communities;

(3) imposes a "family farm" requirement on the FmHA disaster loan program, and provides that eligibility for disaster production loss loans is to be determined on whether the applicant has suffered a disaster loss and not on whether the applicant is located in a disaster county designated by the Secretary;

(4) requires the Secretary of Agriculture to ensure that FmHA loan guarantee programs are responsive to needs of borrowers and lenders;

(5) reforms the provisions governing the composition of FmHA county committees;

(6) provides protection to purchasers of farm products from liens held by the creditors of the sellers if prescribed procedures are followed;

(7) authorizes the Secretary to make grants to enable public or private nonprofit groups to establish rural technology centers; and

(8) makes various revisions in operations of FmHA farm lending programs.

TITLE XIV—NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND TEACHING POLICY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1985

The bill—

extends for five years various authorities to fund agricultural research and extension programs, and makes a number of modifications in program provisions.

TITLE XV—FOOD STAMP AND RELATED PROVISIONS

The bill reauthorizes the food stamp program for five years, and make various modifications in the Food Stamp Act of 1977.

TITLE XVI—AMENDMENTS TO THE TEMPORARY EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1983 AND OTHER COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROVISIONS

The bill extends for two years the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance program.

TITLE XVII—NUTRITION PROGRAMS

The bill—

(1) expands consumer education services to low-income individuals; and

(2) directs the Secretary of Agriculture to include a representative sample of low-income individuals in conducting the Department's survey of food intake, and maintains the Department's nutrient data base.

TITLE XVIII—MISCELLANEOUS

The bill—

(1) establishes additional standards for the commercial processing of eggs for human food;

(2) requires that poultry and poultry products for use as food that are imported into the United States be subject to the same inspection, sanitary, and certain other requirements as poultry and its products produced in the United States;

(3) imposes more stringent requirements on inspection and other standards for imported meat and meat products;

(4) revises and strengthens the Beef Research and Information Act;

(5) establishes a promotion, research, and consumer information program for pork and pork products;

(6) establishes a research and promotion program for watermelons;

(7) increases the maximum penalty for violations of marketing orders;

(8) prohibits the Secretary of Agriculture from terminating a marketing order for any commodity for which there is no Federal price support program, unless termination is favored by a majority of the producers involved;

(9) includes moisture content as a criterion in the official grade designations of grain if it is requested by the government of the country to which grain is shipped;

(10) provides for the establishment of a new grade for grain that exceeds current standards for United States No. 1 grade;

(11) improves quality standards for grain to be exported from the United States with respect to dockage, foreign material, and other factors;

(12) reforms the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act relating to county and community committees;

(13) prescribes provisions to be included in Commodity Credit Corporation storage contracts to reduce costs;

(14) declares as a congressional policy that it is in the public interest to maintain Federal involvement in providing agricultural weather and climate information; and

(15) strengthens provisions denying program benefits to persons growing marijuana or other prohibited drug-producing plants on land they control.

TITLE XIX—NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL POLICY COMMISSION ACT OF 1985

The bill establishes a National Commission on Agricultural Policy to conduct a study and report to Congress on the structure, procedures, and methods of formulating and administering agricultural policies,

programs and practices in the United States.

THE PROLIFERATION OF FEDERAL SPENDING AND THE MAGNITUDE OF THE FEDERAL DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we have a problem in the country. The problem is Federal spending because Federal spending has led us to massive budget deficits. Those deficits and that spending are driving us toward the time when the whole series of issues being addressed by this Congress will proliferate in magnitude to where we will be unable to deal in a meaningful way with a lot of the issues that we hear talked about from day to day in this body.

We have just heard a very eloquent discussion of the farm problems of this country by the chairman of the Agriculture Committee. The farm problem in this country is in large part a problem which has accrued from the deficit problem, from the Federal spending problem.

□ 1640

High interest rates on the farm have done immense damage to the ability of farmers to survive in the market economy, so therefore they have to come to Washington suggesting that dealing with that symptom, we need programs.

The trade problem that we have heard so much about comes largely from the fact that the dollar has risen to such levels as the result of our deficits here and the interest rates that those deficits drive up, that foreign investors coming into this country have in fact brought their money out of their homelands here and resulted in the deficit problem. It has also resulted in the cost of our products overseas going up, which again drives up the trade problem.

Too often around here what we want to deal with, we want to deal with those symptoms. We want to deal with the farm problem as a singular item. We want to deal with the trade problem as a singular item. We do not want to deal with the basic item, spending, the deficit.

You will hear most people in this body go home to their districts and talk a lot about the deficit. My guess is when we were home during the August recess that there was no topic talked about more by the Members of this body as they talked to their constituents than the deficit. I assume that every one of them was saying, "Yes, indeed, I am in Washington. I am going to address that problem." It is something that needs to be ad-

dressed. The American people are saying in overwhelming numbers that they want it addressed. So there is no Member of Congress who would not say that it is not a serious problem that needs to be addressed.

The question is, what are we really doing about it? Now, we have been back in town from that August recess for a couple weeks. Have we in fact done very much about the deficit? I would submit that we have done little or nothing about the deficit. We have failed to address the deficit because we have failed to do the things which are badly needed to address the deficit.

I would tell you that it seems to me there are two basic items that need to be done in order to address the deficit. You can do it in a couple ways. You can, as some of my colleagues in this body suggest, very few, but some do suggest, you can increase taxes. Many people looking at static economics will tell you that the way to get at the deficit is we will simply increase taxes.

The problem is, of course, that what this body has shown itself prolific in doing over the years is spending away all the taxes that we raise. We do not use them against the deficit. We simply spend the money away.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I wonder, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I commend him for the diligent work that he does on and off the floor of this House in relation to the deficit.

I just wanted to mention that I perhaps got overly involved in the process of the plight of the farmer in the discussion that I had previous to the gentleman's time; but we in agriculture, in spite of the traumatic circumstances we face and the very critical situation we face, have contributed almost \$20 billion in the past 5 years toward the reduction of the budget and this legislation that I explained that will begin the process tomorrow will again be under the budget as imposed upon us. We will save approximately \$11.8 billion in the next 3 years as mandated by the Budget Committee as our contribution to the effort which the gentleman so valiantly makes in this endeavor.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I thank the gentleman. I must tell the gentleman that I have some problems with the bill that the gentleman is bringing to the floor, or at least with the rule that is being brought to the floor tomorrow, because while the gentleman evidently has figures to demonstrate that, the fact is as I understand it there are at least three budget waivers necessary in order to bring the gentleman's bill to the floor. One of the things that I intend to discuss at some length in this special order is the fact

that that is exactly the way in which we are getting around the Budget Act is by doing waiver after waiver on rule after rule.

The gentleman's rule is not the first rule that will come out here with budget waivers. It is one of a long series of rules that we bring to the floor with budget waivers in them.

One of my suggestions is going to be in the course of this special order that the way in which we are overspending ourselves is by consciously waiving the Budget Act, which is in fact our disciplinary tool.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WALKER. Yes.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I understand that. I might tell the gentleman, those are technical waivers required by the act, not requested basically by our committee.

We did the cuts. The gentleman is welcome to see the scars and go see where the blood was shed. We did the cuts. We sent the cuts in, but then other rules say that we have to have this waiver; but \$11.8 billion is out and I can show the gentleman the scars and where the blood was shed.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman. I, of course, will wait to see the analysis of that, but I appreciate the work the gentleman has tried to do.

Let me get back to the point that I was making. You can go about this business of trimming deficits by raising taxes, which is not my preferred means, because my experience with that is that Congress spends away all the additional taxes that are raised and therefore the deficits do not drop.

You can also go about the work then of cutting spending. That is at least reducing the rate of growth of spending, because I am one who happens to believe that one of the things you are going to have to do in order to eliminate deficits completely is to have a growing economy and within that growing economy to reduce the rate of Government growth, thereby collapsing the deficit.

In other words, if you have the economy as a whole growing that is bringing in additional revenues, instead of spending away those revenues, use those revenues to eat into the deficits; so that you need a growing economy, plus cuts in spending, not really cuts in programs so much as a reduction in the rate of growth of the Government.

The reason why I suggest that going with the spending cut scenario to be the appropriate one is that if you take a look at the gross national product and what percentage of the gross national product the Federal Government revenues represent, you will find that traditionally over the last couple decades that we have collected 19 percent of the gross national product in revenues for the Federal Government.

That is precisely what we are collecting today.

The American people are not undertaxed. They are overtaxed. We are collecting nearly 20 percent. We are collecting 19 percent of the money being generated by our economy in Federal revenues today.

Despite the fact that we did a massive tax cut, the growth of the economy since that tax cut has led to a situation whereby we are continuing to collect 19 percent of the gross national product in Federal revenues. That is not the cause of the deficit problem. The cause of the deficit problem, the reason why the deficit has been rising, is because we have been spending faster and faster. Up until a few years ago, we were spending about 20 percent of the gross national product at the Federal level for Federal programs, so you had a deficit, but it was a 1-percent GNP deficit. We were collecting 19 percent in revenues. We were spending 20 percent in Federal spending programs; however, within the last few years, largely as the result of the spending that this Congress has determined to do, we have moved that spending from 20 percent up to 25 percent, so we now have a 6-percent gap of GNP in spending; so you are going to have to do something about the spending problem of the Government if you are going to deal with deficits.

All right. How do you go about cutting spending? Well, one of the things you can do is eliminate some programs. I would prefer that route. That is the route that the President suggested in his original budget this year. He had I think it was a total of 19 or 20 programs that he set out to eliminate completely, because once you have them off the books, obviously you are not going to spend any more money for them. So that is one way of reducing that spending growth in Government is to just get rid of the programs.

There are some programs at the Federal level that we can in fact do without; not that they are bad programs, not that they do not serve some people, but in terms of massive deficits that are driving up farm interest rates, that are driving up our trade deficits, that are doing all these terrible things to our economy, there are some things the Federal Government can get along without that essentially are frills in our economic life that we could in fact cut back on and totally eliminate. That is one way of doing it.

I will tell you, Congress is not very sympathetic toward that kind of an idea. The elimination of programs does not go down very well around here. We simply do not have the intestinal fortitude to face up to special interest groups and say, "We are getting rid of your program."

So what you have then, if you are going to cut spending, you have got to begin to trim back on a whole series of programs.

Now, how do you do that? Well, you do it with the budget. You set up a budget and you say, "OK, across the board, this is the way we are going to discipline ourselves."

The Budget Act is a disciplinary tool. It says that within the constraints of the Budget Act, this is the way we are going to spend the money.

Then you have the authorization process and under the authorization process, what we do is we change policy. It is essentially a policy process, so that we change the policy in order to bring down spending. You revise things around the way the program runs. You make the program more efficient, more effective. You trim back the number of people. You change the policy in order to lower the spending.

Then you have the appropriations process and that is where you actually set the spending levels, so you can decide to set the spending levels somewhat lower when you appropriate the money.

In each of those areas then Congress has the opportunity to do the job of trimming back on the spending in order to lower the deficit. The problem is that we do not do that, either, in any of these three areas.

We are engaged in a great shell game with the American people, trying to convince them that indeed under this shell there are real spending cuts and we know exactly what to do about it.

The fact is that we are not really engaging in any kind of a spending cut scenario. We are with regard to the disciplinary tool, the Budget Act, regularly waiving the Budget Act in terms of its implications. In other words, if you believe that the way to get down spending is to discipline our spending habits underneath a set budget, a macroeconomic approach, so to speak, then what you have to do is you have got to enforce the Budget Act. You have got to say that those spending limits set in the Budget Act, we are going to live with.

What have we done since all those great speeches of the recess period where we said we were going to do something about deficits, told our constituents that? What have we done regularly on this floor for the last 2 or 3 weeks? We have waived the Budget Act. On rule after rule that has hit this floor, we have had provisions in them to waive the Budget Act.

What does that mean? It simply says, forget the Budget Act. It is now time to spend the money. The discipline that we imposed upon ourselves, forget it.

What do we hear about waivers of the Budget Act? They are simply tech-

nical violations. It does not really mean anything. It is a technical violation.

Well, let me tell you what some of those technical violations are. For instance, it is regarded as a technical violation if what you are doing is spending money, regardless of the fact that you did not report that you wanted to spend that money by May 15.

People say, "Well, that sounds like a pretty minor kind of thing. What are you complaining about that for?"

Well, for this reason. If in fact you follow the Budget Act, anybody who reports spending after May 15, we could not do it. You would in fact save the money. You would in fact save billions of dollars because the authorization committee did not follow the mandate of the Budget Act. That is more than a technical violation. It may be regarded by the authorization committee that did not meet the deadline as a technical violation. It may well be regarded by the Rules Committee as a technical violation.

The bottom line is, though, the reason it was put in there is so that when we were planning on the budget we would know in advance what the spending priorities were and these committees have not met that time. So therefore we ought not to regard their budget or their money as a part of our budget scenario. That is more than a technical violation, and yet that is what is called technical violations out here all the time.

When we get to the farm bill tomorrow that the chairman and I discussed here a few moments ago, we are going to have a rule on the floor for consideration of that farm bill that will have at least three budget waivers in it. One of the waivers in that bill is going to be to waive the entitlement section of the Budget Act. That is the section of the Budget Act that is supposed to keep us from adding new entitlement spending to the Federal budget without having some kind of prior process.

Tomorrow when the farm bill comes before us, we are simply going to waive that section, despite the fact that most economists taking a look at our budget process say that the entitlement problem is one of the major problems around here.

There are some estimates, the chairman has his own estimates that they have saved \$11.8 billion, there are some estimates which indicate that we may be \$20 billion to \$30 billion over the budget with that farm bill.

And how are we going to carry out that kind of increased spending? We are going to do it by waiving the Budget Act tomorrow, putting the discipline aside and saying that it is now time to authorize and go ahead and spend the money.

So the fact is that Congress has shown itself to be unable to operate

within the discipline of the Budget Act. That is one reason why Congress has overspent its own budget in recent years by \$150 billion. We have committed ourselves to these budgets over the last 5 years and then gone ahead and overspent those budgets by \$150 billion.

□ 1655

So we do not have the discipline and we are not showing the discipline now despite all of the great speeches. We have people, a majority of this body, that continues to go ahead and votes to waive the Budget Act on occasion after occasion after occasion, not once, not just tomorrow on the farm bill. We have voted that way on bill after bill after bill even since the August recess.

What about the authorization process? Surely Congress having not taken the discipline of the Budget Act is willing to do something within the authorization process. Surely Congress, recognizing that the Budget Act does not really apply, is going to do things which are reasonable within the authorization process.

Not since the August recess. Not before the August recess either, but certainly not since the August recess.

We had the Amtrak bill on the floor today. The Amtrak bill is one of those items where we are spending \$600 million. The budget, the budget that we passed, called for us to spend in that area \$582 million.

Did we listen to the budget? Did we authorize within the budget? No, no, we spent \$20 million more than the budget called for.

Within the authorization process we simply decided to go ahead and spend more money. We do not show within that that we are willing to adopt policies aimed at eliminating spending. The fact is that we adopt policies in this body aimed at increasing spending.

Time and time again we develop policies on this floor aimed at increasing spending. Let me give you another example.

Just this week, we had a bill on the floor on the School Lunch Program. There was an amendment offered on the floor which suggested that at least we might be able to save the money that is now going in cash subsidies to reasonably wealthy people. Now no one was arguing the question of whether or not you ought to have school lunches for poor kids. That is one of the priorities I think that is probably readily accepted in this body as being something we ought to do, providing nutritious meals to poor children.

There is some question, though, that once you get 250 percent above the poverty level, not just the poverty level, not just 100 percent above the

poverty level, not just 200 percent above the poverty level, but once you get 250 percent above the poverty level, maybe we ought not to be giving cash subsidies to those families.

You see, the way it is right now, if David Rockefeller had kids in school, we would give him a cash subsidy out of this program. If you had a \$100,000 doctor in the town that sends his kids to the public school, we are giving him a cash subsidy out of Federal money for the school lunches that his kids eat. If you have a \$60,000 lawyer or a \$75,000 Congressman, we are providing those people with cash subsidies so that their children can eat meals at the expense of the taxpayer.

Now at times a massive deficit it strikes me that is not a priority that most Americans would probably think that we need to meet. They do think that we ought to be compassionate enough to feed poor children. The question is whether we ought to be compassionate and feed the children of the rich, too.

What the amendment we had on the floor suggested was we ought to change the policy and provide school lunches to only those people who are at 250 percent above the poverty level and below. Beyond that, we ought to have those people pay the extra \$23 a year that it would cost them to buy the school lunch for their children without a subsidy.

That amendment lost. That change in policy was not acceptable. That was not an acceptable way of saving \$188 million of taxpayers' money.

We are prospending here. The policies that we adopt are prospending. So the authorization process does not work.

What about the appropriation process? Well, then, if we are not going to enforce the Budget Act, we are not going to do something about changing policy in the authorization process, surely then those Members that are talking big talk about eliminating deficits are willing to do something within the appropriation process.

Do not believe it. Do not believe it. Within the appropriation process we are going through all kinds of shenanigans to make certain we can go ahead and spend money.

For example, we have techniques around here of bringing up an appropriation bill to the floor that is said to be within budget, and we bring it out and we say, well, the kinds of money that are in this appropriation bill are, in fact, within the Budget Act. But when you look, you find that there are a couple of little tricks down in there.

For example, on the Food Stamp Program, when we brought it out, we brought it out saying that it was within the budget, that the \$11 billion that was within the appropriation bill was, in fact, the same amount of money as the \$11 billion in the budget.

That is true. That is exactly what was in there.

However, we only funded the Food Stamp Program for 9 months. So we funded it for 9 months at \$11 billion knowing that at some point later on in the year we were going to have to come up with another 3 months' worth of spending, which is another \$2 or \$3 million which will then put us over the budget.

We use that trick around here all the time. For example, we also, in several of the appropriation bills that have been out here, underfunded the amount of salaries that we knew we had to pay the Federal workers in the course of the year, so that at some point during the year, we will have to come back and get enough money to continue to pay the salaries.

We also then have a bias in all of those appropriation bills toward supplemental appropriations, because the way in which you get to this is once you have spent all of the money that was in the appropriation bill, and you have no more money, once you get 9 months into the Food Stamp Program and you are out of money, at that point you pass what is known around here as a supplemental appropriation. It is add-on spending. It is by definition an add-on amount.

And so, therefore, that add-on spending carries you beyond the budget level and results in additional spending, spending beyond what we have committed ourselves to in all of the headlines.

So we do the spending, and then we try to cover it up down in the midst of committee reports, and down in the midst of the language of the bill, and tell the American people that we are living within our means when, in fact, nothing of the kind is happening.

It seems to me that it shows up time and time again that the appropriation process is falling. It is overspending and resulting in deficits. The result is massive deficits. We have a massive spending problem. It is a \$200 billion a year spending problem.

I think the American people need to begin to ask themselves then the question of how do we find out who is responsible for that problem. And I think you need to ask yourself, then, three questions if you are someone who is interested in that. I think you simply ask yourself who is it in the Congress who is voting for budget waivers. If they are voting for budget waivers, they are voting ultimately for deficits.

Your second question: Who is it in Congress who is voting for authorizations that increase spending, because then you have somebody who is contributing to the deficit problem.

The third question: Who is it in Congress that is voting for increased appropriations and supplementals. If you have got somebody who is voting all

three of those things, you have got yourself a spender. If you have somebody who is voting for budget waivers, if they are voting for increases in authorization, and they are voting for increased appropriations and supplementals, if you find them voting in all of those, you have got yourself a spender.

You will know precisely then who it is that is contributing to the Federal spending problem and thus to the deficit problem. There can be no doubt in your mind whatsoever, you have got yourself a spender, and spending is the problem.

Then it seems to me you want to examine the Representative who claims to be doing something about the deficit but is spending us blind. The answers to those three questions need to become very important to the American people. Who is voting for budget waivers, who is voting for increased authorizations, who is voting for increased appropriations and supplementals. If we begin to smoke out the spenders, maybe we can begin to reduce the deficit.

It is high time that we do, and I yield back the balance of my time.

IMPORTED OIL IS BANKRUPTING AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has just passed a dark milestone in our history. We have reverted for the first time in over 70 years to being a debtor nation where we are importing more than we are exporting. This year, our trade deficit is expected to reach a record \$150 billion.

This has grave implications for our economic well-being. It means that we are consuming more and more and borrowing to pay later. It means that the dollar remains overvalued, pricing U.S. products out of foreign markets. It means that U.S. interest rates remain persistently high, dampening economic growth at home.

One way that we can make a significant dent in the trade deficit is to reduce greatly our reliance on imported oil. One-third of the U.S. trade deficit—\$57.3 billion—is due to imported oil.

We can reduce the trade deficit if our Nation at long last follows the recommendations of the U.S. National Alcohol Fuels Commission and the Coordinating Committee on Energy of the Public Affairs Council and the example of Brazil.

The Alcohol Fuels Commission, on which I was privileged to serve, issued a landmark report in 1981 which discussed in great detail how a coordinated public and private national effort to produce alcohol fuels would move the United States toward energy independence. It issued sensible recommendations on how to achieve this.

Let me summarize the Commission's three conclusions. They were:

First, that alcohol-blend fuels, notably gasohol, can help to decrease the consumption of petroleum in the United States;

Second, that the United States must design and make available pure-alcohol vehicles—those capable of running on 100 percent alcohol; and

Third, that the Nation must develop available domestic resources to produce both ethanol and methanol.

In November 1982, the Coordinating Committee on Energy of the Public Affairs Council issued a statement calling for the use of alcohol fuels to replace petroleum fuels in some cases and extend the use of petroleum fuels through blending in other cases. It issued six recommendations which I would like to quote:

1. The central objective of the development and use of alcohol fuels must be to reduce the nation's dependence on non-domestic oil by cost effective use of domestic resources.

2. Abundantly available feedstocks, such as municipal solid wastes, coal and biomass, must be used wherever feasible in the production of alcohol fuels.

3. A significant consideration in the selection and design of alcohol-fuel production systems should be the efficiency of producing liquid fuels, as well as the overall energy efficiency.

4. The production and use of alcohol fuels, as with any fuel, must take place in a manner such that the environmental effects and risks to public health and safety are acceptable.

5. Soil erosion should be minimized in the production of fuel from biomass. Cost of soil losses should be factored into the cost of production of ethanol and methanol from biomass.

6. Government assistance should be to stimulate research and development, assist with regulatory requirements, and provide economic incentives similar to those provided to other agricultural and energy industries.

I recently returned from a visit to Brazil where I saw firsthand how alcohol fuels can be an effective alternative to petroleum fuels.

Brazil's public and private sectors have already established widespread production and distribution systems for alcohol fuels. They have in place automotive manufacturing operations which devote more than 90 percent of its production to alcohol fueled automobiles. It has in place a system for converting older vehicles to alcohol fuel operation. One-third of Brazil's automobiles currently operate on alcohol fuels. In 1984, Brazil shaved \$2 billion from its import bill through use of alcohol fuels.

Since the mid 1970's, Brazil's private sector alcohol fuels industry has generated jobs for Brazilians in many areas of the nation. Also, since 1980, through the use of alcohol fuels the city of Sao Paulo has reduced, by 75 percent, the lead pollution in its air. Lead pollution in the metropolitan area, which contains more than 12 million persons, had reached dangerous levels.

The United States should follow Brazil's example and vigorously promote alcohol fuel development. The benefits for our

Nation would be enormous. The trade deficit would be reduced through ending the importation of foreign oil. Farm surpluses, which are now piling up at record rates in storage bins and driving down commodity prices, could be used to produce alcohol fuels. Environmental pollution caused by petroleum fuels would be reduced through the increased use of alcohol fuel. And Arkansas would greatly benefit because of the pioneering research and development conducted into alcohol fuel production at the University of Arkansas' Biomass Research Center.

Currently, the U.S. alcohol fuels industry produces approximately 500 million gallons a year. This is insufficient to meet our needs. Last year, we imported \$100 million worth of alcohol fuels. The demand in our country will be even greater as lead is eliminated as an octane enhancer from gasoline consumed in the United States.

The time is late but we must start now to make alcohol fuels an alternative to petroleum fuels. Our Nation's environmental, political, and financial health depends on this.

SANDINISTA ATROCITIES REVEALED BY RECENT DEFECTOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, this morning there was in one of the papers a very small blurb in the New York Times about an event yesterday, a press conference, a press availability down at the State Department. In the Washington Times, there was a much larger article about this. In most of our newspapers, and in most of our media, there was no mention of it whatsoever.

But on July 1, a very prominent, relatively high-ranking member of the Sandinistas in Nicaragua defected across the Honduran border and yesterday he was questioned by the media and given an opportunity to give us a view of what it is like on the inside of the Communist Sandinista world.

The New York Times article in today's paper says:

A Nicaraguan defector who said he worked for Interior Minister Thomas Borge asserted today that large numbers of peasants and Miskito Indians had been killed by the Government because of suspicion that they might join United States-backed rebel forces.

Not only did this fellow tell us about that, he also told us about the use of the Cubans who are down there in the area of the Minister of Interior for their internal security matters in planning and carrying out some of the operations, including those connected with the genocide of Miskito Indians. And he also described for us in some detail the aspects that we do not like to think about, but we know exist down there, of the use of the sale and

smuggling of cocaine and other narcotics to raise money for the Communist Sandinistas. And I do not think this ought to go as unnoticed as it has gone up to this point in time. It is too important an issue for the American people. It is too important for our national security for us to not be fully aware of the nature of the type of government and leaders that we are dealing with when we encounter the Nicaraguan Sandinistas.

A lot has been said over the months on the floor of this House about what is or is not good or bad about the government down there, about whether we should or should not be supporting the Contras who are waging a valiant effort to try to restore democracy, about the problems that may be followed if we allow the Sandinistas free rein in terms of what they do to sabotage our neighbors, to bring about the fall of the democracy in El Salvador, to wreak havoc with that fragile democratic force, the Government in Costa Rica, and the emerging one in Honduras.

But I think this is the most clear-cut example of the problem of human rights violations, and the problem of the very basic philosophical, if you want to call it that, orientation of the mind, of the thinking of the leadership of the Sandinistas that I have seen to date.

I would like to tell you who he is. The defector is Alvaro Baldizon Aviles, Baldizon being the last name that we would normally associate in English. He is 26 years old. He joined the Sandinista police in April 1980 and became the chief investigator of a special investigation commission of the Interior Ministry under Thomas Borge for 2½ years. And he received a 10-month criminology course in the Soviet Union.

He tells us that there are probably thousand of Miskito Indians and peasants who have been intentionally executed in the last few years by the Sandinista regime. He said that his figures were an extrapolation of the hundreds that he knew about firsthand as the investigator of the internal abuses.

The killings were carried out, he says, by a mixed commission of Army and police officers. And I quote from the article in the Washington Times yesterday. He says "For those hundreds of names that were inquired about by the Inter-American Human Rights Commission," Mr. Baldizon's commission, that is, the "Commission was ordered to concoct cover stories for their disappearances."

In other words, to explain to us and to the world what had happened in some fictional manner.

"But many others," he said, "not identified by the OAS Commission, went completely unexplained, even though his investigations turned up

other cadavers he was ordered not to identify.

"He said that he had personal knowledge of the executions of 150 Miskito Indians between July and September 1982." This is not from second-hand investigations or reports, not from what someone else told him, but personal knowledge of 150 of these executions.

He also said that "Most of those executed were listed as 'potential enemies' of the revolution, according to criteria established by the security police," for which he worked.

"Usually," he said, "they were suspected of giving aid to the resistance forces or having a relative join the Contras."

I do not think there is much difference between that and all of the other forms of genocide that have unfortunately surfaced in the history of this world, and all too often we have read about in some form or fashion in the past few decades, including most recently what happened under the tyrannical regime of Pol Pot in Cambodia, or as it is now known, Kampuchea. And yet, we have not heard nearly as much about that, even though this genocide, this human killing has been occurring in a country that is very close to the United States, and very vital to an ongoing national security debate that this body has been engaged in for quite some time.

Mr. Baldizon went on to tell us about other things that occur down there. He told about the Cuban involvement. We have known for some time there are several thousand Cuban "advisers" that are in Nicaragua to aid the Sandinistas.

□ 1710

Some of them supposedly are down there for varying missions; most of them, we have been led to believe, and I think are down there under the same kind of cover, really being armed forces members but down there under cover of some other job or task, as were the Grenadan Cubans.

But we have identified 2,000 or 3,000 down there as being there primarily for military purposes.

Mr. Baldizon, though, says that there are 200 or so of these Cuban advisers who are a very integral part of the internal security police forces of Nicaragua that have been carrying out the dastardly deeds that I just described, as he related them.

He says the Cuban advisers at the Interior Ministry are at every level except the lowest office unit. He says in Nicaragua they indirectly give the orders because they have the technical know-how. I find it interesting that he also says the Cubans who rotate every 2 years, according to him, supervise every plan and operation. Any Nicaraguan officer who acts without prior Cuban approval will be demoted if

there is any failure, he said according again to the Washington Times article of today.

Not only does he describe the genocide, the killing intentionally of peasants and Miskito Indians and the involvement of the Cubans directly in this, but he also describes for us the way that the Sandinistas are going about, in large measure, financing their "revolution." Baldizon tells us at yesterday's press conference that Interior Minister Tomas Borge and Vice Minister Luis Carrion actively engaged in the transfer of Colombian cocaine through Nicaragua to the United States markets. He said he had first-hand knowledge, according to the Times article, he said he had first-hand knowledge of one air shipment late last year that was diverted to a rural airfield where Mr. Borge picked up the cocaine to avoid Customs inspections. Another police officer reported the incident to Mr. Baldizon who was ordered to investigate it.

And I quote: "Some days after, Borge called me into his office and called off the investigation," he told the news conference. He said he was told that the matter was a state secret and not to be mentioned further.

He went on to say that cocaine trafficking was still going on when he left Nicaragua July 1. "Cocaine traffic is a necessity because of the need for dollars, and my understanding is that it will not stop."

I think that this is a damning indictment of the Sandinista regime. Many of my fellow colleagues here on the floor have recognized for some time that the Sandinistas were not carrying out their stated democratic intentions, that in fact they are intent on being a part of the international group of Communists that spread the word, so to speak, through revolutionary violence in neighboring countries, that they are truly a very devious and hardened core dictatorship of the Communist ilk with the Stalinist/Leninist philosophy. But despite the fact we have had speeches, copies of speeches from people like Commandante Ramirez who spelled that out before the party activists on one occasion last year, and we have discussed that here on the floor, we have not had until now a high-ranking defector like this come forward with details that set forth the clear human rights violations and the Cuban direct involvement in the drug traffic like we had yesterday.

It is very surprising to me and a little disappointing that more public attention was not given to that particular defector's testimony in front of the media down at the State Department on that occasion.

I trust that as time passes and as more information becomes available from his knowledge and from what we gain from others who defect down

there we will be able to put together a better piece of the entire scene as to what precisely has been going on.

But one thing is clear from what he said and from other reports that have come out to us through our State Department; it is very, very clear that the Sandinistas have intentionally engaged in forms of genocide, that they are financing in large measure their revolution through drug trafficking, through their country to the United States, and that the Cubans who are down there as advisers are not only involved in advising in the military sense but have some direct involvement with the entire internal security matter which, in itself, clearly, from what Mr. Baldizon said, involves the genocide issue.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues and the American public take heed, take warning, and that the next time we have votes on the floor of the House concerning aid to the Contras concerning the question of moneys for training the internal security forces of the neighboring democracies in El Salvador, Honduras, and Costa Rica, that the concerns I have expressed today, that Mr. Baldizon related yesterday, can be taken into account and that we will act firmly and solidly and without nearly the acrimony of the past making a solid and long-term commitment to the resistance of the forces of oppression and communism coming out of Nicaragua and that we are indeed in the future committed solidly behind the forces of those freedom fighters we call the Contras who want to stop this type of spread of communism and terrorism on our southern borders.

I thank the Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

THE ARREST OF LEE YA-PING: AN AFFRONT TO THE AMERICAN HERITAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. LEACH of Iowa asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, friends of Taiwan are deeply concerned over the news of the arrest in Taiwan of Lee Ya-Ping, publisher of a United States-based Chinese language newspaper, on charges of sedition for articles published here in the United States.

Ms. Lee, who is a permanent resident of the United States and married to an American citizen, could face the death penalty for publishing articles which the Taiwan Government alleges promote mainland Chinese propaganda, including a 1982 interview with the former Ambassador from the People's

Republic of China to the United States, Chai Zemin.

Taiwan's conduct in this case is an outrage to all her democratic friends, particularly the United States.

The arrest of a newspaper publisher for the exercise of constitutionally protected freedoms while in the United States must be considered an affront to the American heritage. Our constitutional government is based on the freely given consent of the governed. That consent, our Founding Fathers determined, could only be protected if freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly were guaranteed as bedrock rights. Therefore, it can only be concluded that the arrest of a U.S. newspaper publisher for her professional activities in the United States is an act of intimidation and harassment directed not only against individuals of Taiwanese descent, but against our system of government.

For a foreign government to censure its own press is a violation of civil liberties with which no American can sympathize; but for a foreign government to attempt to muzzle free expression in America itself is a high crime of a profoundly graver nature.

Why, my colleagues might ask, does the Taiwanese Government have so much concern? Part of the answer presumably relates to the desire of Taiwanese authorities to repress potential criticism of their government in the United States. Part is simply a reflection of paranoid authoritarianism. And part may be an understanding that the freedom of dissent that exists here causes America to be a safe haven for political ideas and prospective political organizing. Governments around the world understand that it is no accident leaders of the stature of Sun Yat Sen, Benigno Aquino, and Kim Dae Jung lived in exile at one time or another in the United States. Taiwanese officials, in fact, have told me they are concerned Ms. Lee intends to run for office in Taiwan and therefore shouldn't be considered an American, despite her residency in this country.

But whatever the reasons foreign governments may have for their efforts to stifle dissent in America, we have a responsibility to uphold without compromise our constitutional standards. It is one thing for a foreign government to establish repressive institutions within its borders, but there must never be any tolerance of any kind of intimidation of American citizens or residents on American shores.

In discussing this incident with Taiwanese Government officials I have been struck by the Taiwanese assessment that we Americans should temper our concerns because Ms. Lee has allegedly transgressed Taiwanese laws on sedition by criticizing that government's policies, and that this

criticism is principally a Taiwanese affair because while expressed in the United States, it was done in the Chinese language press rather than in standard American tabloids.

The response of any democrat is obvious: The Constitution of the United States applies to all opinions—good or bad, progovernment or antigovernment—written or spoken in any language on our shores. The fact that criticism may violate Taiwanese laws reflects more on the Government of Taiwan than on Ms. Lee. The issue simply cannot be considered solely in the context of Taiwanese laws. Every person stepping foot in the United States, whether or not an American citizen, is protected by the standards laid down in our Constitution and Bill of Rights. Foreign governments have neither the right nor the authority to violate the civil rights of any individual living in this country. For them to do so sends a chilling message to all Americans of Taiwanese descent living in the United States. It cannot be tolerated.

The Lee incident unfortunately cannot be viewed in isolation. Just this week, we have learned of a series of major arrests by the FBI of individuals here in the United States involved in the so-called United Bamboo crime syndicate. Originally formed in Taiwan, the so-called Bamboo gang gained notoriety earlier this year when it was discovered that two of its members were involved at the behest of high-level Taiwan security officials in the coldblooded assassination in San Francisco of an American critic of the Taiwan Government, Henry Liu. What kind of government, Americans might ask, is it that hires thugs from a crime syndicate which the FBI has charged with drug dealing, extortion, bribery, kidnapping, and murder for hire?

Americans have come over the years to view citizens of Chinese descent as hard-working, education-oriented people embodying all the characteristics of the American dream. To the degree a preception comes to be propagated that some of Chinese descent belong to a Mafia-like secret cult, the ability of all Americans of oriental descent to get ahead is jeopardized. And to the degree Americans come to identify the Taiwanese Government with these thugs, the question will inevitably be asked: What distinguishes the KMT from the Communist Party of so many totalitarian societies?

The arrest of Ms. Lee, the murders of Henry Liu and Dr. Chen Wen-Chen, the accounts of intimidation and harassment of Taiwanese students in the United States underscores an unflattering similarity between the authorities in Taiwan and the authorities in the very Communist countries from which Taiwan hastens to distinguish itself. Political scientists have from

time to time pointed out that the spectrum of right to left among political movements is often not linear but should be viewed as a circle. A frequently cited example is the similarity between the totalitarianism of Hitler's German Republic of the right and Stalin's Soviet Union of the left. While Taiwan and its Communist adversaries today may not pose such an extreme parallel, Taiwan's conduct suggests that there is a similarity between Taiwan and Mainland China not only in denial of political pluralism but in party structure as well. Designed by Soviet Comintern agents in the mid-1920's, the KMT functions as a government within a government, just as does the Chinese Communist Party of Deng Xiaoping. With most government officials belonging to the KMT, the line between party and government is a thin one. The question democrats must ask is why can't opposition parties be sanctioned? Why can't the Government of Taiwan receive the stamp of legitimacy that only the explicit consent of the governed can offer?

There has long been a special tie of friendship between the American people and the people of Taiwan. But the Taiwan Government treads on dangerous ground to assume the United States will continue to tolerate conduct which attempts to treat American soil as a playground for agents of repression.

More importantly, the Taiwanese Government jeopardizes rationalization for its very existence by conducting itself like its adversaries. Largely speaking, economic democracy has been achieved on the island, but on political issues the difference between Taiwan and the mainland appears to be narrowing. For the Western democracies to want to maintain close long-term ties to Taiwan, political democracy cannot be put off much longer.

Although the United States may have a national interest in maintaining warm relations with certain governments which do not protect as assiduously as we do the civil liberties of their citizens, such relations can not provide opportunity and temptation to such governments to abridge the rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution to individuals—citizens and aliens alike—residing within our borders.

The protection and guarantees of the U.S. Constitution are not negotiable. The Taiwan Government has been effectively on notice since 1981 that any action taken by their agents against any individual in this country who is engaged in the lawful exercise of his or her civil and constitutional liberties would seriously jeopardize the warm relations between our Governments.

Symbolically, I believe we have no choice but to ask that Taiwan's CCNAA office in Los Angeles be closed and that the officials of that office be returned to Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is not only one of personal freedom for an individual. It is the future of Taiwan itself. Hopefully calmer, more democratic minds will come to prevail on the island.

To Americans, Taiwan's Government looks more and more like the governments of the Philippines, South Korea, and South Africa. The argument that martial law produces greater stability than democracy has been shot down by the Shah in Iran, Somaza in Nicaragua, Batista in Cuba. For the sake of stability as well as democracy martial law should be lifted. And for the sake of justice, Ms. Lee, must immediately be released.

Martial law may have been warranted by war conditions a generation ago, but today it is the most destabilizing of all factors in Taiwan's domestic political context. The period of democratic tutelage defined by Sun Yat-sen as a necessary step toward democracy should be brought to an end. It is time for martial law to be repealed and for Taiwan's democracy to flourish without interference from various intelligence organs and the Taiwan Garrison Command.

Thank you.

NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK, 1986

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative from a district that includes Orlando and Melbourne areas of central Florida with many tourist attractions, I am very aware of how important tourism is to my district. I think it is significant, however, that 260 of our colleagues have signed on as cosponsors of National Tourism Week for 1986. Members on a bipartisan basis from large and smaller States, urban and rural areas, and from every geographic area of our country, recognize tourism as one of our Nation's greatest assets.

While many areas of the country like mine have long been considered tourist attractions, many other areas are turning toward tourism development as a new source of jobs and increased revenue. As plants closed and more smokestack industries gave way to new technology, many communities across the country turned to tourism to reinvigorate their downtown areas. Convention centers have been built and transportation systems were improved. Food services and hotels were developed specifically to lure more visitors into these troubled areas.

U.S. residents and foreign visitors spent \$210 billion in 1983 traveling in America. This was a 6-percent increase over the pre-

vious year. By encouraging and promoting tourism in our States, we generate new jobs and badly needed revenue. My home State of Florida alone experienced an increase of almost 40,000 new travel-related jobs in 1983.

As secretary-treasurer of the Congressional Travel and Tourism Caucus, I would like to thank those who joined me in co-sponsoring National Tourism Week for 1986. By passing House Joint Resolution 296 today, we once again express our belief that tourism does work for America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, due to a previous obligation, I was unable to be present for the vote on final passage on H.R. 2266, the Amtrak reauthorization. However, had I been in attendance I would have voted in the affirmative.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Washington) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCCAIN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. LUNGREN, for 60 minutes, on September 26.

Mr. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. WALKER, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. MCCOLLUM, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa, for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DE LUGO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. UDALL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. RAY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ALEXANDER, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. RAY, for 5 minutes, on September 20.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LEACH of Iowa) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. NELSON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Washington) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEMP.
Mr. TAUKE.
Mr. GILMAN in four instances.
Mr. BEREUTER.
Mr. GALLO.
Mr. WEBER.
Mr. MCCOLLUM.
Mr. HORTON.
Mr. BROOMFIELD.
Mr. CONTE in two instances.
Mr. FRENZEL in five instances.
Mr. GEKAS.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
Mr. SNYDER.
Mr. KOLBE in three instances.
Mr. LEACH of Iowa.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DE LUGO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RODINO.
Mr. TALLON.
Mr. COELHO.
Mr. SMITH of Florida.
Mr. OWENS.
Mr. SKELTON.
Ms. MIKULSKI.
Mr. HAWKINS.
Mr. WAXMAN.
Mrs. BYRON.
Mr. GAYDOS.
Mr. RAY.
Mr. BONER of Tennessee.
Mr. ATKINS.
Mr. GUARINI.
Mr. SOLARZ.
Mr. HERTEL of Michigan.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 817. An act to authorize appropriations under the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for other purposes, and

S. 818. An act to authorize appropriations for activities under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 20, 1985, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2017. A letter from the Deputy for Programs and Commercial Activities, Office of the Assistant Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting notice of a decision to convert to contractor performance the motor vehicle operations and maintenance activity, Fort Bragg, NC, pursuant to 10

U.S.C. 2304 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2018. A letter from the Deputy for Programs and Commercial Activities, Office of the Assistant Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting notice of a decision to convert to contractor performance the motor vehicle operations and maintenance activity, Fort Lewis, WA, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2019. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a report entitled, "Information on Selected Areas of UDC Operations," pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 455(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2020. A letter from the Acting U.S. Postal Service Records Officer, transmitting notice of a computer matching program between the Postal Service and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2021. A letter from the Plan Administrator, Eighth Farm Credit District Employee Benefit Trust, transmitting the General Accounting Office report for the plan year ending December 31, 1984, for the eighth farm credit district retirement plan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2022. A letter from the General Counsel of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to adopt distinctive counterfeit deterrents for exclusive use in the manufacture of U.S. securities and obligations and to clarify existing authority to combat counterfeiting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2023. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution, transmitting the first report of recommendations for commemoration and coordination of the Bicentennial and related activities, pursuant to Public Law 98-101, section 6(e); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FROST: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 266. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 3248, a bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. 99-276). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DIXON: Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Report on investigation of alleged improper political solicitation (Rept. 99-277). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GLICKMAN: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 127. Joint resolution to grant the consent of Congress to certain additional powers conferred upon the Bi-State Development Agency by the States of Missouri and Illinois (Rept. 99-278). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 267. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2100, a bill to extend and revise agricultural price support and related programs, to provide for agricultural export, resource conservation, farm credit, and agricultural re-

search and related programs, to continue food assistance to low-income persons, to ensure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and for other purposes (Rept. 99-284). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GLICKMAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1863. A bill for the relief of O. Edmund Clubb; with an amendment (Rept. 99-279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLICKMAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1261. A bill for the relief of Richard W. Ireland (Rept. 99-280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLICKMAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1598. A bill for the relief of Steven McKenna (Rept. 99-281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLICKMAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2991. A bill for the relief of Betsy L. Randall (Rept. 99-282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLICKMAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2316. A bill for the relief of Paulette Mendes-Silva (Rept. 99-283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FRENZEL (for himself, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. JONES of Oklahoma):

H.R. 3366. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include obligations issued with respect to certain State student loan programs within the definition of qualified student loan bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENZEL (for himself and Mr. GIBBONS):

H.R. 3367. A bill to extend the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program until November 30, 1985; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 3368. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to continue to enforce exemption regulations regarding the application of the Fair Labor Standards Act to State and local government employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COURTER (for himself, Mr. GALLO, Mr. RUDD, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. WEBER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. ECKERT of New York, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. HYDE):

H.R. 3369. A bill to prohibit the employment of Soviet nationals at United States

diplomatic and consular missions in the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DYMALLY:

H.R. 3370. A bill to require criminal prosecutions concerning violations of the laws of the District of Columbia to be conducted in the name of the District, to provide permanent authority for hearing commissioners in the District of Columbia courts, to modify certain procedures of the District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission and the District of Columbia Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GALLO:

H.R. 3371. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reduce the default rates of direct and guaranteed student loans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ROE, and Mr. RODINO):

H.R. 3372. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Northeast Interstate Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management Compact; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr.

LOWERY of California, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BATES, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOSCO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STARK, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ZSCHAU, and Mr. REID):

H.R. 3373. A bill imposing certain limitations and restrictions on leasing lands on the Outer Continental Shelf off the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 3374. A bill to provide for orderly trade in nonrubber footwear, to reduce unemployment in the domestic shoe industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUARINI:

H.R. 3375. A bill to provide that the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey shall be held at Jersey City, NJ, in addition to those places currently provided by law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTEL of Michigan:

H.R. 3376. A bill to prohibit the issuance of Federal oil and gas leases in the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. IRELAND:

H.R. 3377. A bill to establish a loan guarantee program to help citrus producers replant groves damaged by freezing temperatures in recent winters; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 3378. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the interception of certain communications, other forms of surveillance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOLBE:

H.R. 3379. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a limited deduction for contributions to education savings accounts established for the children of a taxpayer and to provide that amounts received from such accounts for educational expenses shall never be subject to income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOEFFLER:

H.R. 3380. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude the employees of States and political subdivisions of States from the provisions of that act relating to maximum hours, to clarify the application of that act to volunteers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. FISH, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HYDE, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. DeWINE):

H.R. 3381. A bill entitled, "Federal Computer Systems Protection Act of 1985"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLINARI:

H.R. 3382. A bill to prohibit the construction of the Westway highway project in New York and to extend until December 30, 1985, the deadline for withdrawal of approval of such project and for approval of highway and transit projects substituted for such project; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MOODY (for himself, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. MINETA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 3383. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Public Works and Transportation, and Ways and Means.

By Ms. OAKAR (for herself, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. LELAND, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BARNES, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. Wolf):

H.R. 3384. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to expand the class of individuals eligible for refunds or other returns of contributions from contingency reserves in the employees health benefits fund, to make miscellaneous amendments relating to the civil service retirement system and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHULZE:

H.R. 3385. A bill to make parts of certain portable stoves and other kinds of portable heating or cooking apparatus dutiable at the same rate as are such apparatus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire (for himself and Mr. McKERNAN):

H.R. 3386. A bill to authorize a partial transfer of the authority of the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority to the States of Maine and New Hampshire; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. STUMP (for himself, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. HYDE, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. McEWEN):

H.R. 3387. A bill to provide for a congressional security survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 3388. A bill to provide for forfeiture of Federal employee retirement benefits

upon conviction of the felony of unauthorized disclosure of the identity of a covert agent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 3389. A bill to deny tax exemptions to, and income tax, estate tax, and gift tax deductions for contributions to, religious organizations having a substantial interest in the promotion of witchcraft; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON (for himself, and Mr. EDGAR):

H.R. 3390. A bill to provide for research regarding radon exposure and for emergency response to adverse health effects associated with radon exposure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.J. Res. 392. Joint resolution to approve the "Compact of Free Association", and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Foreign Affairs, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. McKINNEY):

H.J. Res. 393. Joint resolution to provide for the temporary extension of certain programs relating to housing and community development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT (for himself and Mr. MICHEL):

H. Con. Res. 195. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Congressional Staff Club; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 44: Mr. HARTNETT and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 864: Mr. WATKINS and Mr. GEJDESON.

H.R. 1099: Mr. DYSON.

H.R. 1156: Mr. BUSTAMANTE and Mr. SEIBERLING.

H.R. 1272: Mr. ZSCHAU and Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.R. 1608: Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

H.R. 1701: Mr. WALGREN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. OLIN, and Mr. WEAVER.

H.R. 1894: Mr. DYSON.

H.R. 2114: Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. FRANKLIN.

H.R. 2164: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. McCOLLUM, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 2365: Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SHARP, Mr. BATES, and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 2406: Mr. SUNIA, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 2489: Mr. ROBINSON.

H.R. 2520: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GREGG, and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 2587: Mr. FLIPPO.

H.R. 2679: Mr. CARPER, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MONSON, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. OBEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. STRANG.

H.R. 2761: Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. YATRON, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 2943: Mr. LELAND, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 2944: Mr. CONTE.

H.R. 3006: Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 3041: Mr. DYSON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FROST, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. BATES, and Mr. REID.

H.R. 3120: Mr. SWINDALL, Ms. OAKAR, and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

H.R. 3237: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. DELAY, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LATTI, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. BADHAM.

H.R. 3275: Mr. COURTER.

H.R. 3357: Mr. ARMEY and Mr. ROEMER.

H.J. Res. 23: Mr. BLAZ, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LOTT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BATES, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CARR, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COBEY, Mr. COELHO, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EARLY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HEPTLE of Hawaii, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. McDADDE, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. McHUGH, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MONSON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SABO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STRANG, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. WIL-
LIAMS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. WOLPE,
Mr. WYDEN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of
Alaska, Mr. ZSCHAU, Mr. COLEMAN of Missou-
ri, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and
Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 79: Mr. GRADISON, Mr. SCHUMER,
Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. RUSSO.

H.J. Res. 105: Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.J. Res. 296: Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.J. Res. 313: Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. HATCHER,
Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska,
Mr. GOODLING, Mr. McCANDLESS, Mr.
PORTER, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. STRANG, Mr.
FAWELL, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr.
SCHAEFER, and Mr. BLAZ.

H.J. Res. 316: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. ROBERTS,
Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida,
Mr. NOWAK, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. RAHALL,
Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. NELSON
of Florida, Mr. WISE, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH,
Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr.
QUILLEN, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr.
GREGG, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. THOMAS of Cali-
fornia, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BONER of
Tennessee, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. WEBER,
Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Ms. OAKAR,
Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. HUNTER,
Mr. PASHAYAN, and Mr. HORTON.

H.J. Res. 319: Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr.
ERDREICH, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WALKER, Mr.
HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. FEIGHAN,
Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. STANGELAND.

H.J. Res. 329: Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ANDERSON,
Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. ATKINS,
Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BEDELL, Mr.
BEVILL, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BONER of Tennes-
see, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mrs. BURTON
of California, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COELHO, Mr.
CONYERS, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELLUMS,
Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DONNELLY,
Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DYMALLY,
Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. FUSTER, Mr.
GILMAN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GRAY of Illinois,
Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HAMMER-
SCHMIDT, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HATCHER, Mr.
HEFNER, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms.
KAPTUR, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr.
KEMP, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr.
LANTOS, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEHMAN of
Florida, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mrs.
LLOYD, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. LUN-
GREN, Mr. McDADDE, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MAD-
IGAN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MAZ-
ZOLI, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOR-
RISON of Washington, Mr. MURTHA, Mr.
NATCHER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr.
PERKINS, Mr. PRICE, Mr. PURSELL, Mr.
RAHALL, Mr. REID, Mr. RINALDO, Mr.
RODINO, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr.
RUDD, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. STUDDS,
Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. VENTO,
Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WHIT-
TAKER.

H.J. Res. 363: Mr. DURBIN and Mr.
KRAMER.

H.J. Res. 365: Mr. MOODY.

H.J. Res. 381: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MOLLO-
HAN, Mr. DYSON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DWYER of
New Jersey, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MRAZEK,
and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H. Con. Res. 158: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan,
Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H. Con. Res. 186: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H. Res. 208: Mr. DeWINE, and Mr. FISH.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, pro-
posed amendments were submitted as
follows:

H.R. 2100

By Mr. OLIN:

—Page [11], strike out line [21] and all that
follows through line [21] on page [35], and
insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the
"Responsible Dairy Act of 1985".

Subtitle A—Milk Price Support

LEVEL OF MILK PRICE SUPPORT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1986 THROUGH 1990

SEC. 211. Effective October 1, 1985, section
201(d) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7
U.S.C. 1446(d)) is amended to read as fol-
lows:

"(d)(1) In order to achieve a balance be-
tween milk production and the availability
of milk and milk products to consumers at
reasonable prices, to protect producers and
consumers from disruptive fluctuations in
the prices of milk and milk products, and to
provide that benefits of increased productiv-
ity in milk production resulting from new
production techniques are shared with con-
sumers, the price of milk shall be supported
in fiscal years 1986 through 1990 as provid-
ed in this subsection. Notwithstanding any
other provision of law and except as provid-
ed in paragraphs (2) and (3), during the
period beginning on October 1, 1985, and
ending on September 30, 1990, the price of
milk shall be supported at the level of
\$11.60 per hundredweight of milk having
3.67 per centum milkfat.

"(2)(A) On January 1, 1986, if the Sec-
retary estimates that in the 12-month period
beginning on such date purchases of milk
and the products of milk under this subsec-
tion (less sales under section 407 for unre-
stricted use) will exceed 10 billion pounds
(milk equivalent) in the absence of a reduc-
tion in the level of price support for milk,
then the level of price support in effect for
such period shall be \$11.10 per hundred-
weight of milk having 3.67 per centum milk-
fat.

"(B) On January 1 of each of the years
1987, 1988, 1989, and 1990, if the Secretary
estimates that in the 12-month period be-
ginning on such date purchases of milk and
the products of milk under this subsection
(less sales under section 407 for unrestricted
use) will exceed 5 billion pounds (milk
equivalent) in the absence of an additional
reduction in the level of price support for
milk, then the level of price support in
effect for such period per hundredweight
milk having 3.67 per centum milkfat shall
be 50 cents less than the level of price sup-
port in effect immediately before such date.

"(C) On January 1 of each of the years
1987, 1988, 1989, and 1990, if the Secretary
estimates that in the 12-month period be-
ginning on such date and under the level of
price for milk in effect immediately before
such date, purchases of milk and the prod-
ucts of milk under this subsection (less sales
under section 407 for unrestricted use) will
not exceed 2 billion pounds (milk equiva-
lent), then the level of price support in
effect for such period per hundredweight
milk having 3.67 per centum milkfat shall
be 50 cents greater than the level of price
support in effect immediately before such
date.

Page [35], line [23], strike out "Sec. 213."
and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 212."

Page [36], line [3] and strike out "Sec.
214." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 213."
Page [37], line [4], strike out "Sec. 215."
and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 214."

Page [35], strike out line [12] and all that
follows through line [7] on page [54].

Page [54], after line [7], insert the follow-
ing:

"Subtitle B—Milk Marketing Orders"

Page [54], line [10], strike out "Sec. 232."
and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 221."

Page [55], line [4], strike out "Sec. 233."
and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 222."

Page [55], strike out line [10] and all that
follows through line [8] on page [56].

Page [56], line [10], strike out "Sec. 235."
and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 223."

Page [56], line [16], strike out "Subtitle
D" and insert in lieu thereof "Subtitle C".

Page [56], line [18], strike out "Sec. 241."
and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 231."

Page [58], line [5], strike out "Sec. 242."
and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 232."

Page [59], line [23], strike out "Sec. 243."
and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 233."

Page [61], line [4], strike out "Sec. 244."
and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 234."

Page [61], line [19], strike out "section.
245" and insert in lieu thereof "section.
235."

Page [62], line [22], strike out "Sec. 245."
and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 235."

Page [63], line [15], strike out "Sec. 246."
and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 236."

Page [63], line [18], strike out "Subtitle
E" and insert in lieu thereof "Subtitle D".

Page [63], line [21], strike out "Sec. 251."
and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 241."

Page [64], line [2], strike out "Sec. 252."
and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 242."

Amend the table of contents of the bill by
striking out the matter relating to title II
and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE II—DAIRY

Subtitle A—Milk Price Support

Sec. 211. Level of milk price support for
fiscal years 1986 through 1990.

Sec. 212. Application of amendments.

Sec. 213. Avoidance of adverse impact of
dairy diversion program on
beef, pork, and lamb producers.

Sec. 214. Study relating to casein.

Subtitle B—Milk Marketing Orders

Sec. 221. Adjustments for seasonal produc-
tion; hearings on amendments;
determination of milk prices.

Sec. 222. Cooperative association represen-
tation.

Sec. 223. Status of producer handlers.

Subtitle C—National Commission on Dairy Policy

Sec. 231. Findings and declaration of policy.

Sec. 232. Establishment of Commission.

Sec. 233. Study and recommendations.

Sec. 234. Administration.

Sec. 235. Financial support.

Sec. 236. Termination of Commission.

Subtitle D—Miscellaneous

Sec. 241. Transfer of dairy products to the
military and veterans' hospi-
tals.

Sec. 242. Extension of the dairy indemnity
program.

By Mr. PETRI:

—Page 516, after line 9, insert the following
new title:

TITLE XX—TOBACCO

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 2001. This title may be cited as the
"Tobacco Deregulation Act of 1985".

REPEAL OF PROVISIONS OF LAW CONCERNING PRICE SUPPORT FOR TOBACCO

SEC. 2002. (a)(1) Section 101(a) of the Ag-
ricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1441(a)) is
amended by striking out "tobacco (except as
otherwise provided herein), corn," and in-
serting in lieu thereof "corn".

(2) Section 101(c) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1441(c)) is repealed.

(3) Section 101(d)(3) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1441(d)(3)) is amended—

(A) by striking out “, except tobacco,” and

(B) by striking out “and no price support shall be made available for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers.”

(b) Sections 106, 106A, and 106B of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1445, 1445-1, 1445-2) are repealed.

(c) Section 408(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1428(c)) is amended by striking out “tobacco.”

REPEAL OF PROVISIONS OF LAW CONCERNING TOBACCO ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

SEC. 2003. (a) Section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1282) is amended by striking out “tobacco.”

(b) Section 301(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1301(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by striking out subparagraph (C),

(2) in paragraph (6)(A) by striking out “tobacco,”

(3) in paragraph (7) by striking out “Tobacco (flue-cured), July 1-June 30; Tobacco (other than flue-cured), October 1-September 30;”

(4) in paragraph (10) by striking out subparagraph (B),

(5) in paragraph (11)(B) by striking out “and tobacco,”

(6) in paragraph (12) by striking out “tobacco,”

(7) in paragraph (14)—

(A) by striking out “(A),” and

(B) by striking out subparagraph (B),

(8) by striking out paragraph (15), and

(9) in paragraph (16) by striking out subparagraph (B).

(c) Section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1303) is amended by striking out “rice, or tobacco,” and inserting in lieu thereof “or rice.”

(d) Part I of subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1311 et seq.) is repealed.

(e) Section 361 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1361) is amended by striking out “tobacco.”

(f)(1) Section 371(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1371(a)) is amended by striking out “peanuts, or tobacco” and inserting in lieu thereof “or peanuts”.

(2) Section 371(b) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1371(b)) is amended by striking out “peanuts, or tobacco” and inserting in lieu thereof “or peanuts”.

(g)(1) Section 373(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1373(a)) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence—

(i) by striking out “peanuts, or tobacco, and” and inserting in lieu thereof “or peanuts, and,”

(ii) by striking out “peanuts, or tobacco from” and inserting in lieu thereof “or peanuts from,” and

(iii) by striking out “all persons engaged in the business of redrying, prizing, or stemming tobacco for producers,” and

(B) in the last sentence by striking out “\$500;” and all that follows through the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof “\$500.”

(2) Section 373(b) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1373(b)) is amended by striking out “peanuts, or tobacco” and inserting in lieu thereof “or peanuts”.

(h) Section 375(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1375(a)) is amended by striking out “peanuts, or tobacco” and inserting in lieu thereof “or peanuts”.

(i) Section 378(f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1378(f)) is repealed.

(j) The Act entitled “An Act relating to burley tobacco farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended”, approved July 12, 1952 (7 U.S.C. 1315), is repealed.

(k) Section 4 of the Act entitled “An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes”, approved April 16, 1965 (7 U.S.C. 1314c note), is repealed.

(l) Section 703 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 (7 U.S.C. 1316) is repealed.

EXCLUSION OF TOBACCO FROM CONCESSIONAL EXPORT SALES PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 480

SEC. 2004. The proviso to the first sentence of section 402 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1732) is amended by striking out “, and for the purposes of title II of this Act,” and inserting in lieu thereof “or”.

PROHIBITION AGAINST COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION USING POWERS WITH RESPECT TO TOBACCO

SEC. 2005. Section 5 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714c) is amended by adding at the end the following new undesignated paragraph: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Corporation may not exercise any of the powers specified in this section or in any other provision of this Act with respect to tobacco.”

PROHIBITION AGAINST TOBACCO MARKETING ORDERS

SEC. 2006. Section 8c(2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 608c(2)), reenacted with amendments by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended—

(1) by striking out “tobacco,”

(2) by inserting “tobacco,” after “(B) any agricultural commodity (except honey,” and

(3) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no order concerning tobacco may be issued or enforced under this Act.”

WITHDRAWAL OF CONSENT RELATING TO COMPACTS AMONG STATES FOR REGULATING TOBACCO PRODUCTION AND COMMERCE

SEC. 2007. (a) The Act entitled “An Act relating to compacts and agreements among States in which tobacco is produced providing for the control of production of, or commerce in, tobacco in such States, and for other purposes”, approved April 25, 1936 (7 U.S.C. 515 et seq.), commonly known as the Tobacco Control Act, is repealed.

(b) The Congress hereby withdraws its consent to any compact or agreement entered into under the Act referred to in subsection (a).

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 2008. (a) The amendments made by sections 2002 through 2006 shall apply with respect to the 1986 and subsequent crops of tobacco.

(b) Section 2007 shall take effect January 1, 1986.

Amend the table of contents at the beginning of the bill accordingly.